

Also, a bill (H. R. 11417) granting an increase of pension to Eli Brainard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 11418) granting an increase of pension to George W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 11419) for the relief of George A. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 11420) granting an increase of pension to Levi W. Short; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLEMORE: A bill (H. R. 11421) granting a pension to Otilia P. Smythe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 11422) granting an increase of pension to William B. Dunlop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11423) granting a pension to Nancy J. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 11424) granting a pension to Belle S. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 11425) granting an increase of pension to William Goodwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 11426) granting an increase of pension to Levi Lindenmuth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 11427) granting an increase of pension to John Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 11428) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Wainwright; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., relative to payment of income and excess-profits taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fond du Lac (Wis.) Woman's Club, against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of faculty of Lake Erie College, of Painesville, Ohio, against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of New York State Ice Manufacturers' Association, against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLASSON: Petition of J. B. Steele, publicity chairman, liberty-loan committee, relative to subscription for liberty loan in Outagamie County, Wis.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GUEST: Memorial of Lancaster (Pa.) Clearing House Association, relative to payment of income and excess-profits taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Memorial of The Bronx Board of Trade, New York City, favoring pneumatic-tube mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Memorial of Northwestern Typographical Conference, opposing the admission of oriental labor into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of the representatives of the building industry of the States of Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Kansas, South Dakota, North Dakota, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin, requesting that a representative from the States mentioned above be appointed to serve upon the war emergency construction board; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Machinist Helpers' Lodge, No. 959, Minneapolis, Minn., asking that Federal control of railroads be given a fair trial before return of roads into private hands; also, asking that no definite time be set for return of public roads back to private capital; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Petitions of Linn County Pomona Grange, favoring prohibition during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Linn County Pomona Grange, favoring law conscripting wealth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Petitions of Goodyear Rubber Co., Weir Fancy Goods Co., Frank B. Peterson Co., Cardinell-Vincent Co., and Newbauer Bros., all of San Francisco, Cal., urging support of Senate bill 3962, relative to payment of income and excess-profits taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of Owensmouth (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, indorsing employment in agricultural pursuits of prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of Ella D. Nicholson, secretary Woman's Club, Thief River Falls, Minn., against use of national parks for grazing purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Young Women's Missionary Society of First United Presbyterian Church, McDonald, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Military Order of Foreign Wars of the United States, in favor of permitting the soldiers and sailors of the United States to receive decorations given by our allies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, April 13, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the comradeship of service brings us very close together in this tragic life of ours. To-day as we meet with the notice of the passing of one of the honored Members of the Senate our hearts are saddened. We thank Thee for his life and for his public service. We bless Thee that he has lived among us, bearing in all the years the white flower of a stainless life. Thou hast called him to the reward of the great beyond. Let Thy blessing rest upon us as we cherish his memory and help us to emulate all his virtues.

And now, O God, as we have come this day to the greatest crisis in our Nation's history, and in the history of the world, we pray Thee to make bare Thine arm to save. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. RANDELL and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

DEATH OF SENATOR BROUSSARD.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, it is with profound sorrow that I announce to the Senate the death of my late colleague, Senator BROUSSARD, who died at his home in New Iberia, La., at 8.30 last night, after a long and very painful illness.

I shall not attempt to say anything about the late Senator at this moment, but at a later time I shall ask the Senate to set aside some hour at which fitting testimonials may be paid to the memory and public services of my deceased colleague.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the following resolutions and ask for their adoption.

The resolutions (S. Res. 224) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. ROBERT F. BROUSSARD, late a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That a committee of eight Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of Mr. BROUSSARD, to be held in the city of New Iberia, La.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed under the second resolution, as the committee on the part of the Senate, Mr. RANDELL, Mr. VARDAMAN, Mr. KIRBY, Mr. KING, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. SHAFROTH.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 15, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, April 13, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, Father Soul, a living, vitalizing presence, ever working in and through the minds and hearts of the susceptible, for the larger life and grander achievements, that human happiness may be advanced.

But alas, for the perversity of human nature and the willfulness of men, we stand before Thee abashed and humiliated at the awful spectacle presented by the world in the terrible tragedy through which we are passing; brought about by the machinations, cunning, and evil designs of comparatively few, who would change the course of human events and subject mankind to the barbarous methods of militarism and autocracy.

Intervene, we beseech Thee, with all the force of Thy holy influence; confound the enemies of civilization and give success to the arms of those who are compelled to fight for human rights; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

APRIL 13, 1918.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I ask leave of absence for three days, to participate in liberty-loan campaigns in my district.
Very truly, yours,

ISAAC BACHARACH.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH, for one week, on account of illness.

To Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi, for two days, on account of illness.

CAPT. H. A. MEYER.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication from the Acting Secretary of War in response to a House resolution. The Clerk will read the communication.

The Clerk began the reading of the communication.

The communication is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 6, 1918.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: With reference to House resolution No. 297, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, directing the Secretary of War to furnish the facts concerning the issuance of a commission as captain to Herbert A. Meyer, which resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, I beg leave to place before you the facts in this connection. Herbert A. Meyer was appointed captain, Quartermaster Reserve Corps, on March 12, 1917. This appointment was made upon the recommendation of the Quartermaster General as the result of an examination conducted by a board of officers in conformity with General Orders No. 32, War Department, 1916. His papers show that he had four years' service with the United States Marine Corps, finishing his enlistment as quartermaster sergeant, and six years' excellent administrative training in civil life. He performed no active service under this commission. On February 16, 1918, with the consent of the Quartermaster General, he was examined by a board of officers under Special Regulations No. 43, War Department, 1917, for appointment to the Signal Corps and found duly qualified for appointment as captain, Signal Reserve Corps, and recommended by the Chief Signal Officer for such appointment. This recommendation was approved on March 16, 1918. His appointment as captain, Signal Reserve Corps, automatically vacated his quartermaster commission.

Attention is invited to the fact that as captain, Quartermaster Reserve Corps, on the inactive list, he was entitled to classification in section 5, Selective Service Regulations. However, he failed to avail himself of this and was placed in class 4, because of a dependent wife and child. Capt. Meyer was examined for his first commission two months before the declaration of war and over three months before the passage of the selective-service law. The foregoing clearly establishes that Capt. Meyer was appointed in conformity with the act of June 3, 1916, as passed by Congress and the regulations as prescribed by the President. He has been continuously in the military service since the date of his commission, March 21, 1917, though not on active duty, and at no time has been subject to selective-service regulations for this reason.

With respect to that part of the resolution which reads, "recent official statements of the War Department discontinuing the issuance of commissions in the Army of the United States to persons in civil life and to registrants under the selective-draft act of May 18," this could be construed to mean that the War Department had announced that the issuance of commissions to civilians and draft registrants had been discontinued absolutely. This is not the fact so far as concerns the various staff corps and departments and the special and technical units provided for in the selective-service act of May 18, 1917. Commissions have been and are under the existing policy issued to qualified applicants from each of the classes referred to in your resolution. No announced policy of the War Department was violated when Capt. Meyer was commissioned captain, Aviation Section, Signal Corps. Any applicant for this or any other staff corps commission, whether from civil life or a registrant under the selective-draft act, with the same qualifications and recommendations, would have been so commissioned.

At the beginning of the war the various staff corps and departments were in the process of a relatively great expansion and their need for properly qualified officers was very great. The heads of the various departments were charged with the responsibility to carry out successfully the war program in so far as it concerned each of them, and as they were responsible for the results it was thought best to give them a comparatively free hand in the selection of their officers to accomplish these results. Appointments were made under the national-defense act, June 3, 1916, and regulations made in pursuance thereof, and without regard to the age of the applicant, except as specified therein, provided he was professionally qualified and recommended by the head of the staff corps or department concerned.

On August 11, 1917, the following instructions were given concerning the commissioning of young men subject to selective-draft regulations:

"The Secretary of War directs that, before staff commissions that do not imply active field service are issued to young men in good physical condition subject to the selective draft, certificate be required that equally well-qualified men who are above the draft-age limits, or who are physically disqualified for active service, are not available."

This rule governed until January 4, 1918. Many applicants for commissions were rejected if they did not have special qualifications for

the work required. Some department heads complained that the work of their departments was being interfered with by the enforcement of this rule. The matter was submitted to the War Council and on January 4, 1918, the following resolution of the War Council was approved and directed to be carried into effect:

"Resolved, That the War Council recommends that hereafter men required by the staff departments, and having special qualifications for the duty for which they are desired, shall be commissioned, provided they do not come in class 1 under the new classifications for the next draft. The council recommends that commissions be not issued to persons in class 1."

This remained in effect until February 4, 1918, when the following amendment was ordered by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Provost Marshal General:

"Only registrants whose class and order number are so late that they are not within the current quota of their local boards shall be eligible to be commissioned in staff corps."

This is the rule, with respect to registrants and civilians, now in effect in so far as regards staff corps commissions; likewise for commissions in special and technical units provided for by act of May 18, 1917.

The policy above outlined has not been violated in the issuance of commissions to persons in civil life or registrants under the selective draft, May 18, 1917.

It will be noted that at no time has it been the policy of the department to refuse to commission civilians or registrants of the selective draft if they were specially qualified and recommended by the head of the staff corps or department that desired their services, though at all times an effort has been made to prevent the appointment of able-bodied young men within the draft age to staff departments unless they appeared to be exceptionally qualified for duty therein.

There have never been any restrictions upon appointments, in so far as concerns the draft age, in the Medical Department. For obvious reasons this was not desirable.

There has been a gradually increasing tendency on the part of the staff corps and departments (Signal, Ordnance, Engineer, and Quartermaster) to confine commissions to enlisted men, unless the applicant had special technical qualifications and training which were desired. The Engineer Corps has conducted three training camps; the Signal Corps is now conducting a large number of training schools in various parts of the country, the Ordnance Corps has commissioned about 100 from its training school and is now conducting a school for securing commissioned officers in the Ordnance Department; and the Quartermaster Department likewise is conducting a school for the purpose of securing officers for that corps.

With respect to commissions in the line (Infantry, Cavalry, Field Artillery, and Coast Artillery), the following policy of the department was announced at the beginning of the war before any troops were officered or organized and shortly after the selective-draft act was passed (June 4, 1917):

"To provide officers for the drafted forces of the National Army, the War Department has adopted the policy of commissioning all new officers of the line (Infantry, Cavalry, Field and Coast Artillery) purely on the basis of demonstrated ability after three months' observation and training in the officers' training camps. Thus, the officers of the new armies will be made entirely on merit and free from all personal or other influences."

This policy has been consistently followed. There has, therefore, been no discontinuing of the issuance of such commissions to registrants under the selective-draft act, May 18, 1917, or to persons in civil life.

The attached lists of officers commissioned in line sections who did not qualify at a training camp but were, however, given line commissions is furnished:

"A." A list of officers commissioned in the Infantry Reserve Corps under authority provided in section 31-A Selective Draft Regulations and assigned to duty as assistants to the governors of the States to assist them in carrying out the selective-draft regulations. These officers will not be assigned, under their commissions, to duty with troops.

"B." A list of colored enlisted men taken from the Regular regiments to provide officers necessary to organize and officer the Ninety-third Division, not enough being provided by the colored training camp.

"C." Maj. Laurence Angel, an ex-officer Porto Rican Regiment, with 16 years' commissioned service, who resigned in 1916 to accept a lucrative position with the Maxims Munitions Corporation. He was a graduate line and staff class, Army Service Schools, Fort Leavenworth. His appointment as major of Infantry was considered and directed by Chief of Staff upon the recommendation of Maj. Gen. John F. Morrison, who was in charge of the service schools. His services were desired for use as an instructor at future training camps.

It is believed that the above is the only one of this class, although it is possible that there may have been a few others appointed under similar circumstances, but it is practically impossible to list such by name without going over the records of all line officers appointed to date, which investigation would require an indefinite length of time.

"D." A list of officers commissioned for purely intelligence work under the direction of the chief of the military intelligence branch of the General Staff. These men were recommended for appointment by the chief of the intelligence branch, and their appointments were made at the direction of the Chief of Staff, and orders have been issued that such officers shall not be assigned to line duty, because they are not qualified for such duty. It was not desired that they be allowed to secure line commissions without having qualified through a training camp. These officers are available for duty wherever their services are needed, at home or abroad, but only for intelligence work.

"E." A copy of the board report on Capt. Meyer's examination and a copy of the recommendation of the Chief Signal Officer.

"F." Training-camp memorandum, containing policy with reference to appointment of line officers.

Very respectfully,

BENEDICT CROWELL,
Acting Secretary of War.

House resolution 297.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
April 5, 1918.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish to the House, for information of the House, as soon as practicable, the facts in reference to the issuance of a commission to Herbert A. Meyer, as captain in the Aviation Section of the Signal Corps; also any information as to whether the recent official statements of the War Department discontinuing the issuance of commissions in the Army of the United States to persons in civil life and to registrants under

the selective-draft act of May 18, 1917, were violated in the case of Herbert A. Meyer; also a list of all commissions which have been issued in violation of such procedure.

Attest:

SOUTH TRIMBLE,

Clerk.

By J. C. SOUTH,
Chief Clerk.

EXHIBIT A.

Name	Age	Address
Maj. Graph J. Hubbard, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	47-3	Montgomery Ala.
Maj. Frank S. Hutton, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	36-2	Sacramento, Cal.
Capt. John Evans, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	33-7	Denver, Colo.
Maj. John Buckley, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	32-11	Hartford Conn.
Capt. Raymond O. Wilmarth, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	33-4	Washington D. C.
Capt. Edward Anderson, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	51-2	Tallahassee, Fla.
Maj. Joel B. Mallet, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	24-1	Atlanta Ga.
Capt. Frank A. McCall, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	47-3	Boise Idaho
Maj. June Smith, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	42-1	Springfield, Ill.
Maj. Robt. C. Baltzell, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	38-8	Indianapolis, Ind.
Maj. Roy W. Snell, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	5-9	Des Moines, Iowa.
Maj. R. Neill Rahn, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	43-1	Topeka, Kans.
Maj. Henry F. Rhodes, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	22-1	Frankfort, Ky.
Maj. Chas S. Miller, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	44-2	Baton Rouge La.
Capt. Wm. Ernest Lawry, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	35-	Augusta, Me.
Capt. Benl. G. Gott, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	52	Annapolis Md.
Maj. Roger Wolcott, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	40-3	Boston, Mass.
Maj. Albert E. Petermann, Judge advocate Michigan National Guard.	41-1	Lansing, Mich.
Maj. John P. Snyder, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	31	St. Paul, Minn.
Lieut. Col. James H. McCord, Missouri National Guard.	58-5	Jefferson City, Mo.
Capt. Harold M. Stewart, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	43-4	Helena, Mont.
Capt. Walter Anderson, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	50-2	Lincoln, Nebr.
Capt. Chas. W. Howard, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	27-6	Concord, N. H.
Maj. Mahlon R. Marzerum, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	51-5	Trenton, N. J.
Capt. R. C. Reid, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	41-4	Santa Fe, N. Mex.
First Lieut. M. A. Holmes, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	22-1	Albany, N. Y.
Capt. G. A. Fraser, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	23-1	Bismarck, N. Dak.
Maj. W. S. Pealer, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	37-5	Columbus, Ohio.
Capt. John E. Cullison, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	50-5	Portland, Oreg.
Maj. Wm. G. Murdock, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	36-9	Harrisburg, Pa.
Capt. Geo. C. Webb, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	49-7	Providence, R. I.
Maj. Rutledge Smith, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	47-4	Nashville, Tenn.
Maj. John C. Townes, jr., Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	31-9	Austin, Tex.
Capt. F. V. Fitzgerald, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	33-2	Salt Lake City, Utah.
Capt. Steven S. Cushing, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	34-1	Montpelier, Vt.
Maj. William W. Sale, Virginia National Guard.	49-6	Richmond, Va.
Capt. Irving W. Ziegans, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	30-8	Olympia, Wash.
Capt. Breckenridge Jones, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	30-3	Charleston, W. Va.
Maj. Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	23-8	Madison, Wis.
Capt. John T. Hunt, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	38-1	Juneau, Alaska.
Capt. H. Godding Field, Quartermaster, Officers' Reserve Corps.	51-7	Honolulu, Hawaii.
Capt. Richard J. VanDeusen, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.	39-1	San Juan, P. R.
Maj. Henry F. Fredeman, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.		Little Rock, Ark.
Capt. Henry G. Parker, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.		Dover, Del.
Maj. John M. Hairston, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.		Jackson, Miss.
Capt. W. J. McCabe, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.		Carson City, Nev.
Maj. Franklin S. Hutchinson, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.		Albany, N. Y.
Maj. John D. Langston, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.		Raleigh, N. C.
Maj. Eugene M. Kerr, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.		Oklahoma City, Okla.
Capt. Richard E. Carville, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.		Columbia, S. C.
Capt. Ray K. Olds, Infantry Officers' Reserve Corps.		Cheyenne, Wyo.

EXHIBIT B.

List of colored officers commissioned in the Reserve Corps or National Army who did not attend the training camp at Des Moines, Iowa. All were enlisted men when commissioned.

Name	Rank	Assignment
Black, Samuel A.	Second Lieutenant.	Newport News (port of embarkation), Va.
Brown, William	do.	Do.
Gaines, Underwood	First Lieutenant.	Do.
Harvey, Jesse J.	Second Lieutenant.	Brig. Gen. Roy Hoffman, 931 Division, Newport News, Va.
Hurt, John	First Lieutenant.	Newport News (port of embarkation), Va.
Johnson, Robert	do.	Brig. Gen. Roy Hoffman, 931 Division, Newport News, Va.
Maryweather, Moses W.	do.	Newport News (port of embarkation), Va.
Newton, Arthur	do.	Do.
Penn, James R.	Second Lieutenant.	Brig. Gen. Roy Hoffman, 931 Division, Newport News, Va.
Simelton, Dove E.	First Lieutenant.	Newport News (port of embarkation), Va.
Thornton, William	do.	Do.

EXHIBIT C.

List of officers commissioned from civil life without attending training camp.

Maj. Laurence Angel, Infantry, National Army; age, 47.

EXHIBIT D.

Officers of the Infantry on intelligence duty.

Name	Rank	Age	Address
Knabenshue, F. G.	Lieutenant colonel, Infantry, National Army.	45-2	Seattle, Wash.
Craig, Henry C.	Captain, Infantry, National Army.	39-9	Hoboken.
Cramer, J. Grant	do.	28-4	Washington.
Hughes, Rupert	do.	45-3	Do.
Tiffany, Chas. L.	do.	40-3	New York.
Tausig, Knox	First lieutenant, Infantry, National Army.	32-5	St. Louis.
Hay, Clarence L.	Second lieutenant, Infantry, National Army.		New York.
Manning, Jos. A.	Captain, Infantry, Officers' Reserve Corps.	38-9	Washington.

EXHIBIT E.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
SIGNAL CORPS, UNITED STATES ARMY.

Record of examination for the Signal Reserve Corps, Aviation Section.

Name in full: Herbert Alton Meyers, captain—nonflying.
If in military service: Rank, captain; organization, Quartermaster Reserve Corps; regiment—station, inactive list.
Present post-office address: 1760 Euclid Street NW., Washington, D. C.
Permanent post-office address: 1760 Euclid Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Date and place of birth: August 30, 1886, at Chillicothe, Ohio, U. S. A.
Educational institutions attended: Staunton Military Academy, Virginia, 1900-1904; George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 1905-1907; National University Law School, Washington, D. C., 1908.
Business experience: Assistant to secretary in charge of Alaskan Railroad and Territories, Secretary of Interior, March, 1917, to date; private secretary to Secretary of Interior, 1911 to 1917; assistant secretary Railroad Securities Commission, United States Government, November, 1910, to March, 1911; clerk, Department of Commerce and Labor, July, 1909, to November, 1910; clerk, headquarters United States Marine Corps, December 26, 1905, to July 14, 1909.

Previous military or naval service or training: Captain cadet corps, Staunton Military Academy, 1903-1904; sergeant Quartermaster Corps, United States Marine Corps, 1905-1909; captain Quartermaster Corps, U. S. A., March 21, 1917, to date.

EXAMINATION.

Physical: Satisfactory if waiver on physical disqualification is granted.
Moral: Satisfactory.
Professional: Satisfactory.
Qualifications for special services: Proficient in automobile driving; studied theory of automobile repair, accounting, storekeeping, surveying.
Remarks: None.

The board is of the opinion that Herbert Alton Meyers has the physical, moral, and professional qualifications to perform efficiently all the duties of captain, nonflying, in the Signal Reserve Corps, Aviation Section, and does recommend that he be commissioned as such immediately.

S. M. DE LOFFRE,

Lieutenant Colonel, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Retired, Examining Board.

R. D. WRENN,

Captain Signal Reserve Corps, Aviation Section,

President Examining Board.

Board met in compliance with Special Order 207, War Department, 1917, and Special Order 284, War Department, 1917.

Present: Lieut. Col. Nelson Gaper, Medical Corps, United States Army, retired, or Lieut. Col. S. M. De Loffre, Medical Corps, United States Army, retired, and Capt. R. D. Wrenn, Signal Reserve Corps, Aviation Section.

Place: Washington, D. C.; date, February 16, 1918.
Applicant personally appeared before examining board on the 16th day of February, 1918, and was accorded the right of challenge, of which privilege he did not avail himself, and was then examined.

EXHIBIT F.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
June 4, 1917.

Memorandum of information. Officers' training camps, August 27–November 26, 1917.

1. GENERAL PLAN.

To provide officers for the drafted forces of the National Army the War Department has adopted the policy of commissioning all new officers of the line (Infantry, Cavalry, Field, and Coast Artillery) purely on the basis of demonstrated ability after three months' observation and training in the officers' training camps. Thus, the appointment of officers of the new armies will be made entirely on merit and free from all personal or other influences.

As an emergency measure to provide officers for the first 500,000 drafted troops the War Department has put in operation 16 officers' training camps, with a total attendance of about 40,000. These 16 camps correspond to the territorial divisions in which it is planned to raise troops under the draft act of May 18, 1917. These camps, which began May 15, 1917, are expected to provide line officers well qualified as to character and training and sufficient for the first increment of 500,000, with a reserve for that increment.

Following the policy of commissioning officers on demonstrated worth it is intended that after the first increment of 500,000 has been organized, officers will be obtained by promoting officers and men already in the Regular Army, National Guard, and drafted forces, thus giving to those who have volunteered or have been drafted for military service full opportunity to earn promotion to the exclusion of those not in actual military service.

The period devoted to the organization of the first 500,000 must therefore be devoted to training and selecting officers for the second 500,000 to supplement those promoted from troops in service.

To meet this situation a second series of officers' training camps will be held beginning August 27, 1917, with the definite mission of producing a body of line officers (Infantry, Cavalry, Field and Coast Artillery) capable of filling all places in the grades above lieutenant and many of the places in the grade of lieutenant in the second 500,000 troops.

The training camps to be established for this purpose will afford those not in the military service, or drafted in the future, the last opportunity to become officers. Also, in connection with these camps it is to be noted that mature and experienced men are needed to fill the higher grades (first lieutenant, captain, major, and a few lieutenant colonels) in the second 500,000.

2. DATE AND LOCATIONS OF CAMPS.

Date (for all camps), August 27 to November 26, 1917.

Locations: Fort Myer, Va. (two camps).—For Divisional Area I (Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut) and Divisional Area V (New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, and Virginia).
Fort McPherson, Ga. (two camps).—For Divisional Area II (congressional districts 1 to 26, inclusive, of New York State, being New York City and contiguous territory) and Divisional Area VII (Alabama, Georgia, and Florida).

Fort Oglethorpe, Ga. (two camps).—For Divisional Area III (New York congressional districts 27 to 43, and Pennsylvania congressional districts 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 21, 25, and 28) and Divisional Area VI (Tennessee, North Carolina, and South Carolina).

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind. (three camps).—For Divisional Area IV (Pennsylvania congressional districts not included above in Area III), Divisional Area VIII (Ohio and West Virginia), and Divisional Area IX (Indiana and Kentucky).

Fort Logan H. Roots, Ark. (two camps), or other place to be designated.—For Divisional Area X (Wisconsin and Michigan) and Divisional Area XII (Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas).

Leon Springs, Tex. (two camps).—For Divisional Area XI (Illinois) and Divisional Area XV (Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma).
Fort Riley, Kans. (two camps).—For Divisional Area XIII (Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa) and Divisional Area XIV (Kansas, Missouri, and Colorado).

Presidio of San Francisco, Cal. (one camp).—For Divisional Area XVI (Utah, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and California).

3. QUOTAS OF CAMPS BASED ON POPULATION.

Each camp will have a quota equaling the population of the divisional area (Census Bureau estimate, 1915) multiplied by .00016. This will give to each divisional area about 1,000 men, and will insure an equal basis of representation to each State in the Union according to population.

4. QUALIFICATIONS.

(1) Classes eligible to apply. Age limits.

(a) Members of the Officers' Reserve Corps (line sections) who, through no fault of their own, were unable to attend the first series of camps; also reserve officers of staff corps under 50 years of age with at least two months' service in war and who have had experience in Infantry, Cavalry, or Artillery.

(b) Noncommissioned officers of the Regular Army recommended in March, 1917, for temporary appointment in case of war, and who, through no fault of their own, were unable to attend the training schools for Regular Army noncommissioned officers in April, 1917. Maximum age limit, 50 years.

(c) Resigned officers of the Regular Army. Maximum age limit, 50 years.

(d) Men of proper qualifications made eligible for the Officers' Reserve Corps by the Army appropriation act of May 12, 1917. Maximum age limit, 50 years.

(e) Men who have qualified for commissions under General Orders, No. 42, War Department, 1915. Maximum age limit, 50 years.

(f) Citizens of the United States who have had war service in the present war as officers or noncommissioned officers of the line in the armies of allied powers. Maximum age limit, 44 years.

(g) Men of exceptional qualifications who tendered their services to the Government prior to June 5, 1917, and who have been listed under General Orders, No. 37, War Department, 1916. Maximum age limit, 50 years.

(h) Citizens with valuable military experience and adaptability for commissioned grade, or citizens who have demonstrated marked ability and capacity for leadership, and are clearly adapted for military service in commissioned grade. Maximum age limit, 44 years.

Note.—Men who applied for the first series of camps must reapply, whether or not certified as suitable for the first camps. Right to enter camp, if selected, is not affected by the fact that applicant is drafted before or after camp begins.

The minimum age limit for all applicants is 20 years and 9 months. However, in order to obtain the experienced class of men desired preference will be given to men over 31 years of age, other things being equal. Because of the anticipated large number of applications it will probably be difficult for men under that age to qualify, except in instances where the applicant has preeminent qualifications or unusual military experience. This applies to the training camps described herein. For later camps see paragraph 1.

5. MANNER OF APPLICATION AND PROCEDURE FOR SELECTION.

All who desire to become candidates will apply on the official application blank which accompanies this circular. Men certified as acceptable for the first series of camps (the camps now in operation), but not directed to attend must in all cases renew their applications. Department commanders have been directed to return to prior applicants papers filed with their previous applications.

A member of the National Guard in Federal service may apply through channels, and, if accepted, will be part of his State quota. While in the training camp he will be on detached service from his National Guard organization.

It is expected that the entire National Guard will be in Federal service before these training camps open. If the applicant's organization is not in Federal service at time of making application he must inclose with his application a signed statement of the adjutant general of the State recommending the applicant as suitable for appointment as an officer, and agreeing to discharge him, or furlough him for three months beginning August 27, 1917, if not in Federal service on that date.

The few noncommissioned officers of the Regular Army who were not in position to be included in the training schools established for noncommissioned officers recommended for temporary appointment will, if accepted, be included in the quota of the State in which they are stationed. These men are highly trained instructors scattered through the country on college or recruiting duty.

Employees of the United States must inclose the signed recommendation and consent of their chiefs.

Area.	Quota.	Those who reside in—	Will mail their applications to examining officer, second training camp—
I.....	128	Maine.....	Fort McKinley, Me.
	72	New Hampshire.....	Fort Constitution, N. H.
	58	Vermont.....	Fort Ethan Allen, Vt.
	587	Massachusetts.....	Fort Warren, Mass.
	96	Rhode Island.....	Fort Adams, R. I.
	196	Connecticut.....	Do.
II.....	972	New York (districts 1 to 26, inclusive).....	Governors Island, N. Y.
	714	New York (districts 27 to 47, inclusive).....	Fort Porter, N. Y.
III.....	272	Pennsylvania (districts 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 21, 25, and 28).....	130 North Washington Avenue, Scranton, Pa.
IV.....	998	Pennsylvania (not included in Area III).....	122 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
	362	New Jersey.....	Trenton, N. J.
	35	Delaware.....	Fort McHenry, Md.
V.....	208	Maryland.....	Do.
	48	District of Columbia.....	Do.
	347	Virginia.....	Fort Monroe, Va.
	379	North Carolina.....	Raleigh, N. C.
VI.....	256	South Carolina.....	Southeast Department, Charleston, S. C.
	361	Tennessee.....	523 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn.
	448	Georgia.....	Fort McPherson, Ga.
VII.....	338	Alabama.....	Clark Building, Birmingham, Ala.
	135	Florida.....	53 West Bay Street, Jacksonville, Fla.
VIII.....	216	West Virginia.....	Charleston, W. Va.
	801	Ohio.....	Columbus Barracks, Ohio.
IX.....	448	Indiana.....	Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.
	377	Kentucky.....	640 West Jefferson Street, Louisville, Ky.
X.....	482	Michigan.....	Fort Wayne, Detroit, Mich.
	395	Wisconsin.....	331 Wells Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
XI.....	719	Illinois.....	Fort Sheridan, Ill.
	304	Mississippi.....	202 West Capitol Street, Jackson, Miss.
XII.....	272	Arkansas.....	Fort Logan H. Roots, Ark.
	288	Louisiana.....	Jackson Barracks, New Orleans, La.
	361	Minnesota.....	Fort Snelling, Minn.
XIII.....	355	Iowa.....	Fort Des Moines, Iowa
	113	North Dakota.....	Fort Lincoln, N. Dak.
	109	South Dakota.....	Fort Sully, S. Dak.
	200	Nebraska.....	Fort Crook, Nebr.
XIV.....	528	Missouri.....	Jefferson Barracks, St. Louis, Mo.
	283	Kansas.....	Fort Riley, Kans.
	152	Colorado.....	Fort Logan, Colo.
	688	Texas.....	Fort Sam Houston Tex.
XV.....	336	Oklahoma.....	Fort Sill, Okla.
	64	New Mexico.....	Santa Fe, N. Mex.
	40	Arizona.....	Whipple Barracks, Ari.
	72	Montana.....	Helena, Mont.
	28	Wyoming.....	Fort D. A. Russell, Wyo.
	64	Idaho.....	Boise Barracks, Idaho.
XVI.....	240	Washington.....	Fort Lawton, Wash.
	130	Oregon.....	Vancouver Barracks, Wash.
	16	Nevada.....	Nev. Nav.
	68	Utah.....	Fort Douglas, Utah.
	457	California.....	Presidio of San Francisco, Cal.

Read the instructions on the application and fill it out carefully. Note particularly that letters of recommendation are not wanted, but only the names of three responsible citizens who know the applicant best. Each applicant must be examined physically at his own expense by a reputable physician, who will fill out the physical report forming part of the official application blank. This preliminary examination is subject to review, and the examining officer may require another examination. Men who submitted physical examinations on the Army blank for the first series of camps may submit these reports in lieu of a new examination.

Applications will be received between June 15 and July 15, 1917. Under no circumstances will an application be considered if received after July 15. It will be promptly returned to the applicant.

Shortly after July 15 Army examiners will visit various points, to be announced, in each State. Applicants selected for personal and physical examination will be notified to appear before the Regular Army

examiner in person at a convenient point for inquiry into his record, capacity, leadership, and qualifications in general, also for further physical examination if deemed necessary by the examiner.

After the personal and physical examinations are completed, and as soon after August 1, 1917, as practicable (not later than August 10), the accepted applicants will be notified when and where to go for the training course.

6. OBLIGATION.

Accepted applicants, unless they are reserve officers or members of the Regular Army or National Guard in Federal service, will be required to enlist for a period of three months, under section 54, national-defense act, and will agree to accept such commission in the Army of the United States as may be tendered by the Secretary of War. The enlistment obligates one to service in the training camp only.

7. APPOINTMENTS AT CLOSE OF CAMPS—AGE LIMITS FOR COMMISSIONS.

Men will be classified and recommended for commissions on the basis of their qualifications as demonstrated during the training. Those eligible under the Officers' Reserve Corps age limits (up to 32 for second lieutenant, 36 for first lieutenant, 40 for captain, and 45 for major), will be commissioned for five years in the Reserve Corps. However, these age limits will not govern all appointments, because under the draft act of May 18, 1917, these age limits do not apply to appointment for the war only. Accordingly, men qualified for commissions (except for the Reserve Corps age limits) will be commissioned in the National Army for the war. In other words, a man of 40 may be commissioned a second lieutenant in this manner if recommended for that grade.

8. PAY AND EXPENSES.

The Government will pay the men in training \$100 per month during the three months' course, and will provide transportation, uniforms, and subsistence, except that reserve officers in training will receive the pay of their grades, and will provide uniforms and subsistence at their own expense.

All accepted applicants are urged, however, to provide their own uniforms in advance, as follows:

- 1 hat, service
- 1 coat, service, olive drab.
- 2 shirts, flannel, olive drab.
- 2 breeches, service, olive drab.
- 1 pair leggings, canvas.
- 1 pair shoes, marching.

The Government will provide all necessary arms and equipment, and the necessary drill regulations and other publications used in the course will be issued to accepted applicants in the camps.

9. COURSE OF INSTRUCTION.

The training will cover a period of three months. For the first month the course will be uniform for all, with the purpose of giving instruction in the duties common to all arms. At the end of a month the men will be divided, according to qualifications and needs of the service, into Infantry, Cavalry, Field and Coast Artillery for special instruction in their respective branches during the last two months. Candidates for Cavalry commissions will be equipped and trained dismounted for service as Infantry.

10. CHARACTER OF MEN DESIRED.

Since the special object of these camps is to train a body of men fitted to fill the more responsible positions of command in the new armies, every effort will be made to select men of exceptional character and proved ability in their various occupations. While it is desired to give full opportunity for all eligible citizens to apply, no man need make application whose record is not in all respects above reproach and who does not possess the fundamental characteristics necessary to inspire respect and confidence.

By order of the Secretary of War:

H. P. MCCAIN,
The Adjutant General.

Memorandum for The Adjutant General.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, April 6, 1918.

The Acting Chief of Staff directs the attached resolution be referred to you for the preparation of the necessary report.

P. P. BISHOP,
Colonel, General Staff, Secretary.

Received appointment section, Adjutant General's office, April 8, 1918.

Done:

H. P. MCCAIN,
The Adjutant General.

Received Office Chief of Staff April 8, 1918.

The SPEAKER. This communication was in answer to a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], and the Chair submitted it to him—

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that it will take about half an hour to read that report, and I can probably dispose of it in a short time by making the motion to refer it to the Committee on Military Affairs, and if recognized to make that motion I can probably in a few words explain so as to save the House some of the time that it would take to read the entire report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, having had the privilege of reading that report I regret that the Acting Secretary of War has not seen fit to furnish the House with all the information that is asked for in the resolution which was sent to that department. The report of the War Department seems to be entirely devoted to a justification for the appointment of Capt. Herbert A. Meyer as a captain in the nonflying branch of the Aviation Corps. It tells what a fine man he is, and all that. Capt. Meyer's character has never been questioned. He may be all that the report says he is. He probably was a very efficient secretary to one of the Cabinet officers of the present administration. But that is not the question. What we did

want to know is what were the military reasons why his appointment has been juggled with by the War Department as the appointment of no officer in the Reserve Corps has been juggled. The report neglects to state that in September last, I think it was, Mr. Meyer was commissioned as a captain in the Quartermaster Corps and ordered for active duty with the Army in France at about the same time when the draft was imminent, and the department neglects to say that there is on file in the War Department, as I understand there is, an order from the Chief of Staff, dated a few days after the first one, revoking the order assigning him to duty in France for some reason not specifically stated, and he returned to duty as the secretary of one of the Cabinet officers.

Mr. SLAYDEN. With the rank of captain?

Mr. ANTHONY. With the rank of a captain on the inactive list. The matter drifted along with Mr. Meyer on the inactive list as a captain of the Quartermaster Corps, and during that time the department has construed that a man declining an order to active service left the corps—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman proceeding by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. No. The gentleman made this statement, that as it would take half an hour to read this communication it would shorten the time if he explained it a minute or two and he would move to refer it to the Committee on Military Affairs and have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Kansas seems to be criticizing a report none of us have heard. He seems to be making a statement that he has certain facts in his possession that are not set forth in that report.

The SPEAKER. What the Chair was endeavoring to do was to shorten up this matter.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Kansas does not seem to be contributing very much to the efforts of the Chair.

Mr. ANTHONY. If the gentleman will have a little patience, perhaps—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not proceed without unanimous consent.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, of course, I do not suppose the motion would be in order unless I had unanimous consent, but I ask unanimous consent that the report be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs without further reading.

Mr. CALDWELL. And that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ANTHONY. I have already made the motion that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, if my memory is correct.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman to make that motion.

Mr. ANTHONY. Then I ask for recognition on the motion.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then it will have to be read, of course.

Mr. GILLET. To save time, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed without reading. Of course, it will be read, if the House wishes it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, I shall not interpose further objection to the gentleman proceeding.

Mr. ANTHONY. Ordinarily an officer appointed in the reserve who receives an order to the active list and is ordered to duty, if he declines that order to active duty, goes back to his status as a citizen. He is dropped from that list. In this case, Mr. Meyer was not dropped from his status as an officer on the inactive list, but for some purpose was kept on the list, and the report from the department neglects to give us that information.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. COX. I wish the War Department had answered the gentleman's resolution. Will not the gentleman introduce another resolution and ask for the information again?

Mr. ANTHONY. I shall renew my motion that this answer be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and then I will introduce another resolution and ask for further information. The case of Mr. Meyer slumbered along all winter until March of the present year, when a reclassification of men eligible to the draft was made. I have ascertained upon good information that about March 17 Mr. Meyer was given a new designation to class 1. The probabilities were strong that this man would be taken in the next draft. Thereupon, by some mysterious influence, Mr. Meyer received an appointment as a captain in the Aviation Corps—the nonflying branch. That appointment was obtained in the face of repeated statements from the War Department that they would not assign young men who were on the draft list to commissions in the Army unless

they were specially qualified from a technical standpoint. Yet Mr. Meyer is given an appointment as captain in the Aviation Corps in the nonflying branch. In order to secure that appointment the Medical Department of the War Department, through some mysterious influence, gives an order waiving a deficiency of 16 pounds in weight, all of which is omitted in the present report. I also understand that in this case some one secured a statement from an officer of the Signal Corps to the effect that this man's services were very badly needed in the Aviation Corps—the nonflying branch—because of the fact that among the 3,500 officers on duty in that corps there were none available that could perform the duty for which he was desired, a preposterous statement on its face. That is the foundation that is carefully laid in the department. Now, after he is appointed, in the face of such a situation, the duties to which he was assigned, as I understand it, were those of superintending the construction of buildings in a camp somewhere out West, a duty that anyone of the 3,500 officers on duty could have performed or perhaps better by some civilian foreman. By the same mysterious influence this man is jumped over the heads of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of other officers already in the Aviation Corps. I hope the House will send for all that information. I want to ask that a stop be put to political influences securing such appointments in the War Department. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. COX. Is this man in class 1?

Mr. ANTHONY. I understand the reclassification in his case was made on March 17, and that he was put in class 1, and that on the day before or after the department gave him this appointment as captain, which made him safe.

Mr. COX. There is no question but that he is of the draft age?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is no question but he is of draft age.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman know whether he is married or single?

Mr. ANTHONY. I understand he is married.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. The gentleman is very much opposed to political influence in appointments by the War Department, as I understand it?

Mr. ANTHONY. I absolutely am.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Would my colleague be willing to inform the House just how many appointments from his district there are in Gen. Crowder's office and in the Judge Advocate General's office?

Mr. ANTHONY. From my district?

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not know exactly. I think a couple of officers have been appointed from my district; perhaps three officers; and I will state that two of them were appointed on the initiative of the department alone, without consulting with any Member of Congress or any Senator that I have heard of.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Would the gentleman be willing to state what their politics is?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will not say as to that. I am not discussing appointments in Gen. Crowder's office. I am discussing appointments in the line of the Army, and in the Army as a whole.

Mr. CALDWELL rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. CALDWELL. I want to speak on the motion when the gentleman has concluded.

The SPEAKER. That can be dealt with later.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to proceed, the country has been scandalized by publications in the great newspapers of the country, especially the Chicago Tribune, of lists of hundreds of young men, most of them members of prominent families, most of them of very rich families of the millionaire class, most of them with strong political connections, who in the face of repeated assurances from the War Department to Members of Congress that men of the draft age will not be directly commissioned, have been appointed and assigned to noncombatant places in all the different bureaus of the War Department scattered over the country, where they can not smell powder, as a gentleman in my rear suggests. There is no doubt but that the power of appointment in the War Department has been grossly abused.

And before I close my remarks here on the floor and ask that the reply of the Acting Secretary of War be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs for further action, I want to express my fear that in the present crisis which faces the country

the War Department is not taking proper steps to provide sufficient trained commissioned officers for the great army we are trying to raise.

For the last three months the War Department seems to have been stricken with a palsy in the matter of raising a great body of commissioned personnel to officer the next body of troops that we are going to put into the field. For several months the originally established training camps of the line have not been in operation in this country. They were abandoned in favor of training men in the cantonments with the troops. I happen to know that a section of the General Staff has made the strongest kind of recommendations to the Secretary of War that immediate steps be taken toward the training of another large body of commissioned officers to officer the next body of men that we are going to draft in this country, and so far the department has not taken a single step along that line. Gen. McCain believes we should have a reserve of 50,000 trained officers of the line to make up possible losses in the field in France, and Gen. Wood only to-day urges that another large body of men be put into immediate training for commissions. I say it is time that some life were shown and some activity displayed toward raising and training not less than 50,000 commissioned officers to train and lead the next great draft of troops that are to be called into service.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that no steps are being taken to provide training for officers?

Mr. ANTHONY. No steps are being taken to reopen or establish the original training camps for the training of officers of the line.

Mr. HAYDEN. A series of training camps started on January 5, and they are just closing now, at every cantonment in the United States. A Member of this body has been training at one of these camps.

Mr. ANTHONY. Those are training camps most largely for enlisted men who are on duty at those cantonments; but the training camps proper, for officers of the line, as I understand it, closed several months ago.

Mr. HAYDEN. These are for officers of the line. I am sure the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Does not the gentleman think the proper policy is what the department is doing, recognizing at these training camps these men who have had the courage to go into the enlisted ranks? Does the gentleman want to indorse the idea of taking men from civilian life and putting them into training camps?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; I appreciate what the department has done, but within the next month or two all of these organizations will be in France, where they ought to be. We are going to raise a great levy of absolutely untrained men, and in my opinion it is not good military policy to take the commissioned officers altogether from the ranks of these new levies of men. Enough men best fitted to be officers ought to be in training now at properly established officers' training camps before we withdraw all these organizations from this country.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to make the point of order that the gentleman from Kansas is not discussing the matter before the House. The gentleman was given consent to discuss a report, the reading of which had not been completed, and to dispose of it in a very few moments. The gentleman did proceed for a time to discuss that report in his own way, but now he has branched off into another proposition entirely. It seems to me the gentleman ought to proceed in order, out of regard for those of us who did not object to the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think the gentleman has the slightest ground for his assertion. My remarks have been entirely along the line of the subject of my inquiry, and I have kept faith with the House, because my remarks have taken less time than it would have taken to read the report; and if it will relieve the gentleman's mind any I will state to him that I am about through with the few words that I have had to say.

The SPEAKER. The question involved in this report was about one man, and the gentleman's later remarks have been concerning the War Department.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the Speaker that the question involved the appointment of a great many other men.

Mr. SLAYDEN rose.

Mr. ANTHONY. If I may yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], I will after that move the previous question on my motion.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman just now stated that he approved of the policy of the War Department in promoting men from the ranks to be commissioned officers?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Has there been a proper rigid adherence to that policy?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; there has not. There has been the widest divergence from that policy, as I say, in the matter of these favored sons with political influence and sons of families able to pull the strings.

On March 22, 1918, this article appeared in the Chicago Tribune:

[By a staff correspondent.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 21 (special).

Reports that commissions have been issued to 62,000 noncombatant officers, although the combatant officers number only 63,000, and that thousands of the noncombatant officers are of draft age, are to be investigated by Congress.

The Senate Committee on Military Affairs has decided to act, and Senator THOMAS, of Colorado, Democrat, to-day introduced a resolution calling on the War Department to state how many noncombatant reserve officers are of draft age.

"If reports are true, that there has been wholesale commissioning of young men of draft age to staff jobs, whereby they not only escape the draft but will escape fighting for their country, I do not think it is a very good thing for the morale of the American Army," Senator THOMAS said.

A MAZE OF UNIFORMS.

Washington is the grand headquarters of the noncombatant officers, for there are few men, young or old, of the thousands performing even clerical duties in the war offices who have been unable to obtain commissions. There have not been so many uniforms in Washington since the grand review of the Union Army at the close of the Civil War.

Many young officers of wealth and influence are sharing the discomforts of an overcrowded Capital with hundreds of men of draft age, but in more modest circumstances, who have obtained noncombatant commissions, War Department clerkships carrying exemptions from the draft at the request of Secretary Baker or assignment by Secretary of the Navy Daniels to the "inactive list" of the Naval Reserve.

THE CASE OF BROWN.

Perhaps the most unusual noncombatant commission so far issued is that possessed by L. Ames Brown, the 27-year-old bosom friend of Secretary Tumulty and late assistant of George Creel, chairman of the Committee on Public Information. Young Mr. Brown, placed in class 1 of the draft during his service in the Creel bureau, was made a first lieutenant and assigned to "intelligence duties solely" in Washington and New York, with the proviso that he should "not be assigned to any other duty or the command of troops under this appointment."

Humphrey Redfield, son of the Secretary of Commerce, is an assistant pay clerk, with a desk in the Navy Supply Bureau. He was commissioned an ensign after his graduation from Amherst College, and since that time has married and brought his bride to Washington.

ONE DANIELS IN SERVICE.

The only one of Secretary Daniels' four sons in the service is Josephus, Jr., who enlisted in the Marine Reserve Corps and was assigned to duty in the Marine Corps office in Philadelphia. Recently he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Quartermaster Department of the Marine Corps Reserve. Lieut. Daniels' duties do not take him to sea.

Secretary of Agriculture Houston's son, David, Jr., has been commissioned an ensign in the Navy and assigned to duty on a patrol vessel in the second naval district. His service will be on the New England coast.

Secretary of State Lansing has no children. The only representative of the family in the commissioned ranks of the service is John Foster Dulles, Mrs. Lansing's nephew, who has been commissioned a captain and assigned to the Army War College.

HAMMOND IS EXEMPTED.

John Hays Hammond, Jr., son of the millionaire mining engineer, is in Washington, engaged in work upon the radio torpedo which he invented, and which he believes can be made useful in this war. The device is to be given a test eventually, he says, by a War Department board headed by Gen. Wood. Mr. Hammond was exempted from the draft at the request of Secretary of War Baker.

A younger brother, Richard Hammond, enlisted in the Naval Reserve as a boatswain's mate, first class, in May, 1917, and is now in the Yale unit of the Naval Reserve in training for eventual service on a coast-patrol vessel in the New England district. Service on coast-patrol vessels is confined to this side of the Atlantic. Another brother, Harris Hammond, who was married last week, is engaged in business in New York.

STRAIGHT IS A MAJOR.

Willard Straight, of the American International Corporation, was commissioned a major early in the war and sent to France for a short time to straighten out the question of pay allowances and insurance for soldiers and dependents. Maj. Straight, who was formerly in the American Diplomatic Service, married Dorothy Payne Whitney, daughter of the late millionaire, William C. Whitney.

Charles R. Crane, one of the President's most intimate friends, has three of his kin in the Government service. Two are in Washington, while a young nephew, Charles R. Crane, 2d, is a second lieutenant in the Ordnance Procurement Division, assigned to Chicago.

These Ordnance Department assignments are generally called "bomb-proof" jobs in Washington parlance.

SOME CHICAGOANS THERE.

Among Chicagoans who have been busy with war work in Washington is Jack Peabody, son of F. Stuyvesant Peabody, who, it is reported, has been assigned to the Department of Gases, United States Army.

George R. Nichols, Jr., is a captain of ordnance, whose assignment has been in Washington. He is a son-in-law of Dr. Frank Billings. Charles Barnett Goodspeed, of Chicago, is also an ordnance officer, with an assignment, at last reports, in this city.

Edward S. Moore, also a millionaire Chicagoan, is now a major of ground aviation.

Thomas S. Chalmers, of Chicago, son of William J. Chalmers, former vice president of Allis-Chalmers, is in the procurement division of the Ordnance Bureau, and has taken an appointment in Washington.

Perry H. Keeney, a wealthy young Chicago lawyer, Harvard '06, obtained a captain's commission in the National Army, although not being required to pass through an officers' training camp, and has been assigned to duty at the War College.

W. J. Carboy, son-in-law of former Gov. Dunne, of Illinois, is a second lieutenant in the contract section of the Ordnance Bureau.

Melvin Ericson, the young son-in-law of Charles G. Dawes, was brought to Washington as confidential assistant to Secretary Baker. Later he was given a commission as captain in the Signal Reserve Corps. Recently he filed charges against Gen. Thomas Cruse, retired.

HE'S A NONFLYER.

Charles Marshall, brother of Mrs. Marshall Field, 3d, was recently commissioned a first lieutenant in the nonflying branch of the Aviation Service and assigned as adjutant of the One hundred and eighty-fourth Aero Squadron, at Hicks, Tex. Although under 30, Lieut. Marshall is wealthy. He married Miss Alice Huntington, sister of Mrs. Vincent Astor. The Marshalls spent the winter in Washington, occupying Ivanwood, a Virginia estate, a few miles from the Capital.

Winthrop Murray Crane, Jr., son of the former Senator from Massachusetts, is a major in the Ordnance Supply Bureau here.

Burchell Dunbar Adams, a wealthy New Yorker, who married Edith Gracie, daughter of Col. Archibald Gracie, one of the *Titanic* survivors, was drafted, but later was able to secure a commission. He lived with his bride in the Gracie home in Nineteenth Street until recently transferred to New Haven, Conn.

Anthony J. Drexel, Jr., of Philadelphia, a member of the wealthy Drexel family, recently was made a second lieutenant and assigned to the Ordnance Department. He will live in Washington.

SON OF MRS. STOTESBURY.

After a six weeks' special course at Annapolis, an ensign's commission in the Navy was given to James H. Roberts Cromwell, son of Mrs. Edward Stotesbury, who recently accepted the chairmanship of the Woman's Naval Auxiliary of the Red Cross, created by Secretary of the Navy Daniels to supplant the Navy League Comforts Committee, which had incurred his displeasure. Mrs. Stotesbury built a submarine chaser for her son, with the understanding that he was to command it. The Government, however, did not accept the boat, and she has now presented it to the New York post of the Junior Naval Reserve as a training craft.

Ensign Cromwell has been assigned to the battleship *Louisiana*. Robert Goelet, of the rich and prominent New York family of that name, received a captain's commission and was assigned to the postal censorship substation at New Orleans.

Col. E. M. House, the President's chief confidant, has no sons, but has two sons-in-law, one of whom, young Gordon Auchincloss, is in the office of—

And so forth.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have submitted the names of a good many gentlemen who have not been appointed.

The SPEAKER. The question of the gentleman from Texas and the answer of the gentleman from Kansas are extraneous to this subject.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, that is not at all necessary. Under the rules of the House the report would go to the committee.

The SPEAKER. That would be true if the Chair had not interrupted the reading of the report, and the Chair wanted to get the House out of the hole it got into. This report will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and further insist upon its amendment No. 44, still in disagreement.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. LEVER presented a conference report on the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, to be printed in the RECORD under the rule.

LIABILITY TO MILITARY SERVICE OF CERTAIN REGISTERED PERSONS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution under consideration yesterday.

The Clerk read the title of S. J. Res. 123, providing for the calling into military service of certain classes of persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to move the previous question on this joint resolution and all the amendments to the final passage?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to the floor. I claim the floor on the amendment which I offered. I wish to make a statement to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent—

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. No; I had the floor when the House adjourned yesterday.

The SPEAKER. That is true. The gentleman undoubtedly had the floor. The only thing that the Chair was studying about was whether the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] had the right to move the previous question at this particular juncture.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I withhold my motion.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia, but it was distinctly understood that if he yielded the floor for the purpose of permitting the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] to move to adjourn the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] would have an hour when we reconvened this morning. On that statement is he not entitled to recognition by the Speaker immediately upon the taking up of this bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he is.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday evening, when I introduced this amendment to the present bill, it embodied in terms a bill that I had already introduced earlier in the session, and which had been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. Now, I have been assured by the Committee on Military Affairs that that bill, which is now before them, will receive their prompt consideration and action. The question has never been debated or passed on by the committee, and therefore I am anxious to have the committee consider it and not embarrass the present legislation by injecting into it a matter that might complicate the operation of the draft under the law as it is now framed. All I desire is to secure for the people who I think need protection from the draft consideration by this House of their claims. The only purpose of the amendment was to place farm labor on the same footing that is given labor in shipbuilding yards. In view of the fact that the adoption of this amendment may embarrass the prompt passage of the necessary legislation for the new draft, and in view of the fact that this matter has never been considered by the Committee on Military Affairs, that there is a bill now pending before it which has the same object, which I am assured will receive prompt consideration, I ask leave to withdraw the amendment. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia withdraws his amendment.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

Mr. BURNETT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURNETT. As I understood the ruling of the Chair a short time ago, in a matter that is before the House the gentleman has no right to withdraw it without unanimous consent. I want to know, because I want to register my opposition to the withdrawal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has in mind the rule that prevails in Committee of the Whole. Anybody can withdraw anything in the House without asking unanimous consent, clear up to the time it is voted on. It is not so in Committee of the Whole. The gentleman from Kentucky moves the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WALSH. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. The resolution having been considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, is it in order to take a separate vote on the amendments agreed to by the House?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is the universal practice.

Mr. GARNER. I think the Speaker is mistaken about that. I want to suggest to the Chair that if he will refer to the precedents he will find that where bills are considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole and amendments adopted, it is not necessary to take another vote on the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I rise to inquire of the Speaker what action was taken by the House as to that part of the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska which struck out certain language of the resolution. The Record, on page 5438, shows:

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the Shallenberger amendment.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker I demand a division of the amendment. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky demands a division of the amendment, and the Clerk will report the first proposition in it. The Clerk read as follows:

"Quotas for the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, or subdivisions thereof, called under the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 18 1917, entitled 'An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States,' shall hereafter be determined in proportion to the total number of persons registered and liable for military service therein, including resident aliens who have waived all claims for exemption."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to that proposition, the first half of the Shallenberger amendment.

As far as I recall, no action has been taken by the House on the substantive proposition of the gentleman from Nebraska to strike out a certain part of the Senate resolution. The fact is the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska was not a motion to strike out and insert, but a substantive proposition to strike out certain lines of the joint resolution as reported to the House and to add—not to insert in lieu thereof—but to add at the conclusion of the Senate resolution certain substantive propositions which were divisible under the ruling of the Chair into two parts. Action has been taken by the House on the substantive parts of the divisible proposition, but no action, so far as the Record shows and followed the procedure in the House, has been taken on that part of the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska which sought to strike out a certain portion of the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, the question which the gentleman from Wisconsin raises was raised yesterday, when we voted on the measure. If the Chair will observe the language of the resolution, that part of my amendment which proposed to strike out certain language of that resolution has no application whatever to the second part of my amendment, and when the attention of the Speaker was called to that in debate I made the statement, and the Speaker accepted it, that the portion of the amendment adopted went to the end of the bill, and that part which called for the striking out of certain language was defeated.

Mr. STAFFORD. No action has been taken by the House on the substantive proposition to strike out, which was a distinct proposition of the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Notwithstanding the lack of action on the part of the House, as claimed by the gentleman from Wisconsin, I submit that it is now too late for the House to act on the matter, the previous question having been ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the statement made by the gentleman from Nebraska is absolutely correct, that his amendment proposed to strike out certain things and the House refused to strike out, and then voted on the new matter added at the end of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Chair will permit, no action at any time has been taken by the House on the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska to strike out these lines.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I think if the gentleman will reflect, he will recall that the part of the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska to strike out was read as the first half of his amendment when the amendment was defeated.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will refer to the Record he will see—

Mr. WALSH. I do not care what the Record says.

Mr. STAFFORD. That no reference was made to that portion of the amendment in which it was sought to strike out certain lines of the resolution.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. It certainly was read, for I noticed it, and that is borne out by the Record, on page 5059, where the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] says:

The motion to strike out the lines of the first part of my amendment was voted down, and this will go to the end of the bill—

Referring to the second part of his amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. He may have made that statement, but no action was taken upon it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I submit in respect to the point of order that even if it is conceded that everything is precisely as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] states, it is perfectly immaterial. We have added substantive language to this resolution, by an amendment which did not require a preliminary motion to strike out anything. If the motion to strike out has never been acted upon, what earthly difference will that make? The amendment has added a new paragraph to the resolution. That action has been taken, and it is a matter of no concern whatever what becomes of the motion to strike out, which was necessary only in the event that the Shallenberger amendment was adopted as a whole. It was

a necessary part of that portion of the Shallenberger amendment, which was rejected. Therefore, it may be fairly considered as nonexistent with respect to the amendment, which was actually adopted. Hence when that part of the amendment to which the motion to strike out applied, failed to carry, that action can be considered as a substantial disposition of the motion to strike out.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Virginia is correct, and the vote is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 334, nays 3, answered "present" 9, not voting 85, as follows:

YEAS—334.

Alexander	Elston	Kreider	Sanders, Ind.
Almon	Emerson	La Follette	Sanders, La.
Anderson	Esch	Langley	Saunders, Va.
Anthony	Estephal	Larsen	Schall
Ashbrook	Evans	Lazaro	Scott, Mich.
Aswell	Fairchild, B. L.	Lea, Cal.	Scott, Pa.
Austin	Fairchild, G. W.	Lee, Ga.	Scully
Ayres	Fairfield	Leibach	Sells
Baer	Farr	Lenroot	Shackelford
Bankhead	Ferris	Lesher	Shallenberger
Barkley	Fields	Lever	Sherley
Barnhart	Fisher	Linthicum	Sherwood
Beakes	Flood	Little	Shouse
Beshlin	Focht	Littlepage	Siegel
Black	Fordney	Lobeck	Sims
Blackmon	Foss	Loungan	Sinnott
Bland	Foster	Longworth	Sisson
Boehrer	Francis	Lufkin	Slayden
Bowers	Frear	Lunn	Slemp
Brand	Freeman	McArthur	Sloan
Britten	French	McCulloch	Small
Browne	Fuller, Ill.	McFadden	Smith, Idaho
Browning	Fuller, Mass.	McKenzie	Smith, Mich.
Brumbaugh	Garl	McKeown	Smith, C. B.
Buchanan	Garland	McKinley	Snell
Burroughs	Garner	McLaughlin, Mich.	Snook
Butler	Garrett, Tenn.	Madden	Stafford
Byrnes, Tenn.	Garrett, Tex.	Magee	Stagall
Caldwell	Gillett	Mansfield	Stedman
Cannon	Glynn	Mapes	Steele
Cantrell	Godwin, N. C.	Martin	Stevenson
Caraway	Goodwin, Ark.	Mays	Stevens, Miss.
Carlin	Gould	Merritt	Sterling, Ill.
Carter, Okla.	Graham, Ill.	Miller, Minn.	Stevenson
Cary	Gray, Ala.	Montague	Stines
Chandler, N. Y.	Greene, Iowa	Moore, Pa.	Strong
Chandler, Okla.	Greene, Mass.	Moore, Ind.	Sumners
Church	Greene, Vt.	Morgan	Sweet
Clark, Fla.	Gregg	Morin	Swift
Clark, Pa.	Griffin	Mott	Switzer
Classon	Hadley	Mudd	Tague
Claypool	Hamilton	Nelson	Talbot
Coady	Hamilton, Mich.	Nichols, S. C.	Taylor, Ark.
Collier	Hamilton	Nichols, Mich.	Temple
Connally, Tex.	Hardy	Nolan	Thompson
Connelly, Kans.	Harrison, Va.	Oldfield	Tilman
Cooper, Ohio	Haskett	Oliver, Ala.	Tilson
Cooper, W. Va.	Hastings	Oliver, N. Y.	Timberlake
Cooper, Wis.	Haugen	Olney	Treadway
Cox	Hayley	Osborne	Van Dyke
Crago	Hayden	O'Shaunessy	Vare
Cramton	Hayes	Overstreet	Venable
Crisp	Heaton	Padgett	Vestal
Crosser	Helm	Paige	Vinson
Currie, Mich.	Helvering	Park	Voigt
Dale, N. Y.	Hersey	Parker, N. J.	Wahlow
Dale, Vt.	Hilliard	Peters	Wash
Dallinger	Holland	Phelan	Walton
Darrow	Houston	Platt	Ward
Davidson	Howard	Polk	Watson
Davis	Hull, Iowa	Pou	Watkins
Dempsey	Hull, Tenn.	Price	Watson, Pa.
Denison	Humphreys	Purnell	Watson, Va.
Dent	Husted	Quin	Weaver
Denton	Igoe	Ragsdale	Webb
Dewalt	Ireland	Rainey	Wellfing
Dickinson	Jacoway	Raker	Welty
Dill	James	Ramseyer	Whaley
Dillon	Johnson, Ky.	Randall	White, Me.
Dixon	Jones, Tex.	Rayburn	White, Ohio
Dominick	Kahn	Reavis	Williams
Dooling	Kearns	Reed	Wilson, Ill.
Doolittle	Keating	Robbins	Wilson, La.
Doremus	Kehoe	Roberts	Wilson, Tex.
Doughton	Kelley, Mich.	Rodenburg	Wingo
Drane	Kelly, Pa.	Rogers	Winslow
Dupré	Kennedy, Iowa	Romfue	Wood, Ind.
Dyer	Kennedy, R. I.	Rose	Woodyard
Eagan	Kies, Pa.	Rouse	Wright
Eagle	Kincheloo	Ruby	Young, N. Dak.
Edmonds	Kitchin	Rucker	Young, Tex.
Elliott	Knutson	Russell	Zihlman
Ellsworth	Kraus	Sabath	

NAYS—3.

Burnett

Gordon

Huddleston

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9.

Bell
Blanton
Good.Lundeen
MondellThomas
TinkhamWheeler
Wise

NOT VOTING—85.

Bacharach
Borland
Brodbeck
Byrnes, S. C.
Campbell, Kans.
Candler, Miss.
Carew
Carter, Mass.
Cleary
Copley
Costello
Curry, Cal.
Decker
DeLaney
Dies
Donovan
Dowell
Drukker
Dunn
Fess
Flynn
Gallagher

Gallivan
Gandy
Glass
Goodall
Graham, Pa.
Gray, N. J.
Griest
Hamilton, N. Y.
Harrison, Miss.
Heflin
Heintz
Hensley
Hicks
Hollingsworth
Hood
Hutchinson
Johnson, S. Dak.
Johnson, Wash.
Jones, Va.
Juul
Kettner
King

Kinkaid
LaGuardia
London
McAndrews
McClintie
McCormick
McLaughlin, Pa.
McLemore
Maher
Mann
Mason
Meeker
Miller, Wash.
Moon
Neely
Norton
Overmyer
Parker, N. Y.
Porter
Powers
Ramsey
Rankin

Riordan
Robinson
Rowe
Rowland
Sanders, N. Y.
Sanford
Scott, Iowa
Sears
Smith, T. F.
Snyder
Stephens, Nebr.
Sterling, Ia.
Sullivan
Taylor, Colo.
Templeton
Towner
Volstead
Walker
Woods, Iowa

So the Senate joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. SEARS with Mr. DOWELL.

Mr. DECKER with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

Mr. BORLAND with Mr. GOOD.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina with Mr. HICKS.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. ROWE.

Mr. GANDY with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. CURRY of California.

Mr. THOMAS with Mr. WHEELER.

Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. TINKHAM.

Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. PARKER of New York.

Mr. CLEARY with Mr. SANFORD.

Mr. DELANEY with Mr. SANDERS of New York.

Mr. DIES with Mr. COPLE.

Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. FESS.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. GOODALL.

Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOOD with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. JONES of Virginia with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.

Mr. MCANDREWS with Mr. KING.

Mr. MCLEMORE with Mr. KINKAID.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOON with Mr. MASON.

Mr. NEELY with Mr. MILLER of Washington.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. ROBINSON with Mr. RAMSEY.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. TEMPLETON.

Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. TOWNER.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. VOLSTEAD.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. JUUL.

Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. WOODS of Iowa.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, three of my colleagues, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BACHARACH, and Mr. GRAY, are unavoidably absent. If they were present, they would all vote "yea."

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make the statement that my colleague, Mr. CANDLER, is sick and unable to be here. If he were present he desires me to state that he would vote "yea" for the bill.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague, Mr. MECKER, is unavoidably absent to-day, and if he were present he would vote "yea" for this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "yea."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name was called?

Mr. BLANTON. I came in just after my name was called.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not vote.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask to be marked "present."

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] is sick and confined to his room. He wishes me to state that if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts, is absent on account of illness. He desires me to say that if he were present he would vote "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. FIELDS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen have 10 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on Senate resolution 123.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen have 10 legislative days in which to extend remarks on the resolution just passed. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, requested me to say that if he were present he would vote for the bill.

TO PUNISH THE DESTRUCTION OR INJURY TO WAR MATERIAL, ETC.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I present the conference report on the bill S. 383, known as the sabotage bill, and ask to have it printed under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 383. An act to punish the destruction or injury of war material and war-transportation facilities by fire, explosives, or other violent means and forbid the hostile use of property during time of war, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed under the rule.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I desire to be recorded as present on this vote.

The SPEAKER. Too late.

Mr. TINKHAM. But I was present.

The SPEAKER. Why did not the gentleman answer "present"?

Mr. TINKHAM. Because I happened to be in the door, that is all. I wanted to vote "yea," but could not hear my name when called.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman was present, he has a right to be recorded present.

Mr. TINKHAM. Thank you.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] be permitted to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] be permitted to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, my apology for taking even five minutes of the time of the House at this time is the very serious situation on the western front and my desire to have the membership of the House visualize it. We read in the morning papers that Field Marshal Haig has issued a statement to his men to the effect that they are standing with their backs against the wall and no more ground must be given. The wall to which he refers is indicated by the gray line on this map.

These two maps are two sheets of the same map and connect here [indicating]; the one that is at the top should be moved down until it joins the lower one here [indicating]. It is a map on a scale of practically 4 miles to the inch, so that you can estimate the distance in that way.

Ten days ago I presented the lower section of this map, which showed the situation at that time in Picardy. The red line indicated here shows the then front, about 10 miles from Amiens. Since that time and up to April 5 the map shows only these slight gains indicated by the purple thread. The advance made from April 1 to April 5 was a minor thrust westward, just north of the Cojeul River, pushing out as far west as Mercatel and Neuville. Also, a little farther south from Alette, pushing out to Douchy, reaching its greatest depth at Hebuterne and extending southward and slightly to the west, leaving Albert about a mile within the German lines. Since that time the changes have been so slight on that section of the map as to be difficult of recording, even on a map of this scale, 4 miles to the inch. The latest changes of any significance were in this corner [indicating], to the southeast of the Somme battle field.

On April 8 the line indicated in red here in the vicinity of Ypres on this northern half of the map was the line held. The line in brown is the line that was held on the night of the 9th of April. The territory included represents one day's work, breaking through the Portuguese sector of the line here [indicating] and pouring through on both sides of the break.

The next day's line is indicated by the green thread. You will note that to the north of Armentieres this line runs from Houthem, by way of Messines and Ploegsteert, to Houplines here, while on the south of Armentieres it runs from Premesques, through Sailly and Estairese, to a point 1 mile west of Richebourg, connecting at Givenchy, which latter has been held stubbornly since.

These two salients thrust westward on the second day created what is called in the papers "the pocket," in which is Armentieres. Note the two deep salients driven westward making the intervening eastward salient at Armentieres still deeper. It was so deep that it was untenable, and the British had to withdraw.

The white thread indicates the position on April 11. It runs from Hollebeke, approximately through Wyttschaerte, Nieppe, Steenwerck, and Vielle Chapelle, connecting with the line of April 10 at a point 1 mile west of Richebourg, then down to Givenchy, the pivot, which has been held ever since.

The situation last night at 10 o'clock is indicated by the gray thread, much farther to the west, which includes almost as much territory as was taken the three days preceding. This line now runs from Wyttschaerte, through Neuve Eglise, Bailloul, Vieux Berquin, Neuf Berquin, and Merville, rejoining the line of April 10 and 11 about a mile west of Richebourg, the line being about 4 miles from Bethune at the narrowest point.

This was the situation last night at 10 o'clock, according to the last dispatches that were received from Gen. Pershing and Gen. Bliss. This map was very kindly arranged for me by a competent officer in the Chief of Staff's office, and is as nearly correct as it can be made from the official dispatches. It contains no secret or confidential information, but is intended to be helpful, as I am sure it will aid us in more clearly visualizing the situation.

A MEMBER. What do you make out of the situation?

Mr. TILSON. It is far from hopeless, but bad enough.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How far is the line from Calais?

Mr. TILSON. About 40 miles. It is about 25 miles from the line to Dunkirk.

Mr. SUMNERS. What point of most strategic importance is made toward by the last thrust?

Mr. TILSON. The Channel ports.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What change has been made at the bottom of the map?

Mr. TILSON. Not enough to be indicated on the map.

Mr. ROGERS. Do you think that Ypres is the German objective now?

Mr. TILSON. I would not say that Ypres is the objective. Ypres is held by a very strong line at the east, very difficult to push back at that point. If the enemy pushes very much farther here to the south of Ypres it would probably render it untenable.

Mr. FARR. Where is Gen. Goff's army?

Mr. TILSON. It was down here in this section of the region of the Somme.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where the coal fields are?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. TILSON. I thank you, gentlemen. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the military bill.

Mr. DYER. Reserving the right to object, is the gentleman's speech on the bill?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. DYER. Did the gentleman speak on the bill?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. ESCH. And I make the same request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch] made the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURNETT. Was an order made yesterday that those who spoke on the bill should have time for extending remarks?

The SPEAKER. That was the understanding of the Chair. The order was made that everybody who spoke could extend their remarks.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DYER. Have these requests been made to extend their remarks on the bill itself?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

PERSONAL STATEMENT.

Mr. OVERMYER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. OVERMYER. I want to make a statement. I was down at one of the departments when the vote was taken on the military bill. If I had been here, I would have voted "yea."

PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. RUSSELL. To ask unanimous consent. There was a sort of tacit understanding yesterday, pension day, that after the bill then pending was finished the pension bill could be called up. I ask unanimous consent that the pension bill H. R. 11364 be now taken up and considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 11364. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11364) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read for amendment.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Nathan L. Nims, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William B. Hazeltine, late of Company A, Twenty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse Mather, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert N. Lafferty, late of Company B, Fiftieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George M. Estes, late of Company H, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse Roark, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Hall, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment, and Company F, Tenth Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Schoffer, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment, and Company C, Second Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sallie Blevins, helpless and dependent child of George Blevins, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer

Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month: *Provided*, That the pension heretofore granted Luzenia Brown shall not be affected by this act.

The name of Louis Irons, late of Company M, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph A. Craig, late of Company F, Seventy-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Prior, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Shocker, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Ames, widow of Florian W. Ames, late of Company C, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Josephus Gatten, late of Company G, Ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank F. Randolph, helpless and dependent child of William F. Randolph, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mathew Stamets, late of Company K, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Taylor, late of Company G, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph G. Kitchen, late of Company I, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph K. Kelly, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Barger, late of Company B, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clay Jackson, late of Company B, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Miller, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Paul Schools, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George R. Watt, late of Company D, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary F. Church, widow of Milton Church, late of Company L, First Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Lulu Hendrixson, helpless and dependent child of William N. Hendrixson, late of Company E, One hundred and seventy-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. H. Adams, late of Company I, Two hundred and sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William K. Pinson, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joel A. Fugh, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Goodman, late of Company K, Twenty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David F. Black, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company B, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret J. Rogers, former widow of George Musser, late of Company F, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Jacob H. Gimstead, late of Company F, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lytle McCracken, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Fourth Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Beasley, late of Company G, Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles J. Edington, late of Company C, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Sixth Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Felix Gremore, late of Company F, Ninety-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eli Miller, late of Company I, Eighty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Rolls, late of Company A, One hundred and seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sylvanus C. Oppelt, late of Company D, Twenty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Stonelock, late of Company I, Twentieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel B. Bailey, late of Company E, Sixty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David S. Oliphant, late of Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Naylor, helpless and dependent child of Alfred Naylor, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Alfred H. Wrenn, Jr., late of Company E, Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Emrich, late of Company H, Thirty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry R. Playford, late of Company G, Ninety-second Regiment, and Company I, Sixty-fifth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William L. Campbell, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Groesbeck, late of Eighty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Wilkinson, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Donnellis, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza J. Fosha, divorced wife of George W. Fosha, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John Fasnacht, late of Company K, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Wyatt, late of Company F, One hundred and first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Fuller, late of Company F, Twenty-sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Noffsinger, late of Company K, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Harrell, late of Company C, Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James N. Beasley, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hannah Lane, widow of Peter H. Lane, late unassigned, Twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of James M. Hummer, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David A. Ladd, late of Company F, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Goodwin, late of Company K, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nancy E. Benedict, widow of Lafayette Benedict, late of Company C, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Alvin W. Every, late of Company E, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen K. Lyon, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margie A. Ralnes, former widow of William Mathews, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Edward Springer, late of Company C, Thirtieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Wilson, late of Company B, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Thirty-second Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patterson Short, late of Company A, One hundred and eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hamilton Campbell, late of Company E, Sixty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Reuben A. Anderson, late of Company B, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard C. Newsom, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles A. Young, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John P. Belt, late of Company D, Forty-eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Harvey, late of Company G, Twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horace E. Adams, late of Company H, Forty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Landress, former widow of William Landress, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Polly Fields, widow of George Fields, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Eli Ingraham, late of Company G, Fiftieth Regiment New York Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Quail Erity, late of Company H, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jerry A. Fitzgerald, late of Company G, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam A. Worthington, late of Company C, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Smith, late of Company K, Fifty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Buckle, late of Company E, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Carrie L. Kibbe, widow of Howard C. Kibbe, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Lucius S. Hitchcock, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nancy C. Jones, widow of Euphrates Jones, late of Company H, Sixty-third Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of James O. Batten, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathan N. Spence, late of Company B, Eighty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin Hereford, late of Company L, Sixth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Boyce, late of Company D, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Edmiston, late of Company E, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph L. Middleton, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Maria Wilson, widow of John H. Wilson, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Van Stewart, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Simeon D. Chelf, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Phedora J. Black, former widow of John L. Black, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of David A. Gage, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Emma Chase, widow of Augustus L. Chase, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Darius N. Shaw, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph W. King, late of Company F, Twenty-ninth Regiment, and Company E, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Keene, late of Company B, Sixty-seventh Regiment, and Company F, Sixty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas R. Thompson, late of Company A, Seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie Ridgway, widow of William Ridgway, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Burton M. Goines, late of Company A, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Stolcolp, widow of Frederick Stolcolp, late of Company D, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Hezekiah E. Hawver, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Bannon, late of Company B, Forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ephraim Whitson, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry F. Sager, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Milton T. Bedford, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. McCurdy, late of Sixth Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucian B. Walker, alias Burt Crowell, late of Company H, Forty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William S. Webb, alias William Stoddard, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Counts, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mitchell Mason, late of Company F, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles B. Griffin, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles McCarroll, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Battery K, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Minihan, late of Company E, One hundredth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram H. Reed, late of Company D, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel V. Bocock, late of Company H, Sixty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia A. Gorman, widow of Robert Gorman, late of Company I, Ninety-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Otis Gorman, helpless and dependent child of said Robert Gorman, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Julia A. Gorman, the name of said Otis Gorman shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Julia A. Gorman.

The name of Foster D. Brown, late of Company B, Forty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin Macy, late of Company H, One hundred and second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Sherrard, late of Companies A and C, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Morrison, late of the Signal Corps, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dallas Runyon, late of Company C, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Allen, late of Company D, Sixtieth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henrietta Schmidt, former widow of Peter Eberle, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Arvilla I. Briggs, widow of John F. Briggs, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Eva Briggs, helpless and dependent child of said John F. Briggs, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Arvilla I. Briggs, the name of said Eva Briggs shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Arvilla I. Briggs.

The name of Zerah T. Baker, late of Company G, Forty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Charles, late of Company H, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah L. Wyatt, late of Company B, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joshua S. Fisher, late of Company C, First Battalion Delaware Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathan C. Messick, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Molten R. Pepper, late of Companies F and C, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah C. Frankford, widow of Edward Frankford, late of Company B, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Mathias Klingel, late of Company I, Twenty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Archable Dougherty, late of Company F, Fiftieth Regiment, and Companies E and D, Fifty-second Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry W. Wright, late of Company C, Ninety-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin De Gloppe, late of Company D, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel W. Spring, late of Company B, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George D. McKinney, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel M. Boone, late of Company D, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Johnson Hatfield, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Phineas B. Ewan, late of Company G, Sixty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Green, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah Coffman, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Agee, late of Company M, Third Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Burcham, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Jack, late of Third Independent Battery, Iowa Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George A. Burgess, late of Company F, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lettie Edie, widow of Arthur S. Edie, late of Company A, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Edie, helpless and dependent child of said Arthur S. Edie, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Lettie Edie, the name of said Mary E. Edie shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Lettie Edie.

The name of Martin T. Shadwick, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah J. Farlow, late of Company B, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Monmonier, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Letzkus, late of Company G, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Davidson, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel J. Henderson, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sylvania Farmer, former widow of Denton Farmer, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of William B. Carr, late of Company E, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horace E. Hand, late of Company H, First Regiment United States Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph B. Doan, late of Company E, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Edward Searls, late of Company H, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Custer, late of Company I, Sixtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Welcome Ashbrook, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thaddeus Clark, late of Company B, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles J. Mead, late of Company F, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Hamon, late of Companies F and G, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William L. Stephenson, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment, and Company A, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alonzo Green, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James F. McLuen, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Etta C. Bartholomew, widow of William S. Bartholomew, late of Company E, Twenty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Almeron D. Martin, late of Company D, Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriet L. MacGregor, widow of Peter MacGregor, late of Company H, First Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Charles H. MacGregor, helpless and dependent child of said Peter MacGregor, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Harriet L. MacGregor, the name of said Charles H. MacGregor shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Harriet L. MacGregor.

The name of Joseph Wiley, late of Company D, One hundredth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Hartley, helpless and dependent child of John Hartley, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Myrtle Collier, helpless and dependent child of George W. Collier, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Beal, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. King, late of Company F, Ninety-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Brady, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sedonia A. Smedley, widow of Henry A. Smedley, late of Company L, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Lemuel T. Smedley, helpless and dependent child of said Henry A. Smedley, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sedonia A. Smedley, the name of said Lemuel T. Smedley shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Sedonia A. Smedley.

The name of James A. Rives, late of Company E, Fifty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William P. Underwood, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel P. Thurber, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Williams, late of Company F, Fifty-third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Smith, late of Company D, Forty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Sare, late of Company I, Twenty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Brocius, late of Company H, Ninety-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George C. Miller, late of Company B, Twentieth Regiment Iowa Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Mitchell, alias William Terow, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Second Regiment New York Veteran Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Axline, late of Company B, Second Battalion Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Bivens, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 7, strike out "\$36" and insert "\$40."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment increases the pension of Charles H. Williams, late of Company F, Fifty-third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, from \$36 to \$40 per month.

This bill is a substitute for the following bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 578. Nathan L. Nims.
H. R. 792. William B. Hazeltine.
H. R. 794. Jesse Mather.
H. R. 863. Robert N. Lafferty.
H. R. 864. George M. Estes.
H. R. 1152. Jesse Roark.
H. R. 1318. George W. Hall.
H. R. 1475. Jacob Schofield.
H. R. 1884. Sallie Blevins.
H. R. 2047. Louis Irons.
H. R. 2150. Joseph A. Craig.
H. R. 2521. William H. Prior.
H. R. 2627. Thomas J. Shocker.
H. R. 2799. Mary A. Ames.
H. R. 3574. Josephus Gatten.
H. R. 3583. Frank F. Randolph.
H. R. 3591. Matthew Stamets.
H. R. 3890. Henry C. Taylor.
H. R. 4052. Joseph G. Kitchen.
H. R. 4205. Joseph K. Kelly.
H. R. 4208. Jacob Berger.
H. R. 4324. Clay Jackson.
H. R. 4358. James Miller.
H. R. 4424. Paul Scheoos.
H. R. 4649. George R. Watt.
H. R. 4930. Mary F. Church.
H. R. 5043. Lulu Hendrixson.
H. R. 5129. William H. H. Adams.
H. R. 5212. William R. Pinson.
H. R. 5454. Joel A. Pugh.
H. R. 5499. Benjamin F. Goodman.
H. R. 5502. David F. Black.
H. R. 5728. Margaret J. Rogers.
H. R. 5784. Jacob H. Olmstead.
H. R. 6088. Lyle McCracken.
H. R. 6311. James W. Bensley.
H. R. 6365. Charles J. Edington.
H. R. 6424. Felix Gremore.
H. R. 6631. Eli Miller.
H. R. 6632. James Ralls.
H. R. 6888. Sylvanus C. Oppelt.
H. R. 6889. George Stoneking.
H. R. 6734. Daniel B. Bailey.
H. R. 6840. David S. Oilphant.

H. R. 6865. George H. Naylor.
H. R. 7052. Alfred H. Wrenn, Jr.
H. R. 7212. William Emrich.
H. R. 7213. Henry R. Playford.
H. R. 7307. William L. Campbell.
H. R. 7401. John W. Groesbeck.
H. R. 7593. John Wilkinson.
H. R. 7752. Joseph Donnell.
H. R. 7949. Eliza J. Fosha.
H. R. 7983. John Fasnacht.
H. R. 7990. William J. Wyatt.
H. R. 8025. George H. Fuller.
H. R. 8041. John I. Neftzinger.
H. R. 8098. Francis M. Harrell.
H. R. 8111. James N. Beasley.
H. R. 8120. Hannah Lane.
H. R. 8131. James M. Hummer.
H. R. 8281. David A. Laid.
H. R. 8379. John M. Goodwin.
H. R. 8393. Nancy E. Benedict.
H. R. 8449. Alvin W. Every.
H. R. 8505. Stephen K. Lyon.
H. R. 8542. Margie A. Raines.
H. R. 8555. Edward Springer.
H. R. 8663. Thomas Wilson.
H. R. 8743. Patterson Short.
H. R. 8862. Hamilton Campbell.
H. R. 8884. Reuben A. Anderson.
H. R. 9000. Richard C. Newsom.
H. R. 9070. Charles A. Young.
H. R. 9088. John Belt.
H. R. 9089. John W. Harvey.
H. R. 9115. Horace E. Adams.
H. R. 9130. Mary C. Landress.
H. R. 9196. Polly Fields.
H. R. 9203. Eli Ingramham.
H. R. 9225. Quail Erity.
H. R. 9266. Jerry A. Fitzgerald.
H. R. 9279. Adam A. Worthington.
H. R. 9435. George W. Smith.
H. R. 9443. Joseph Buckle.
H. R. 9469. Carrie L. Kibbe.
H. R. 9528. Lucius S. Hitchcock.
H. R. 9549. Nancy C. Jones.

H. R. 9588. James O. Batten.
H. R. 9634. Nathan N. Spence.
H. R. 9659. Franklin Hereford.
H. R. 9670. Isaac Boyce.
H. R. 9719. Henry C. Edmiston.
H. R. 9721. Joseph L. Middleton.
H. R. 9746. Maria Wilson.
H. R. 9757. Van Stewart.
H. R. 9759. Phebe D. Chelf.
H. R. 9804. Phedora J. Black.
H. R. 9804. David A. Gage.
H. R. 9805. Emma Chase.
H. R. 9821. Darius N. Shaw.
H. R. 9825. Joseph W. King.
H. R. 9921. Daniel Keene.
H. R. 9925. Thomas R. Thompson.
H. R. 9939. Annie Ridgway.
H. R. 9947. Burton M. Goines.
H. R. 9997. Mary A. Stolcolp.
H. R. 10015. Ezekiah E. Hawver.
H. R. 10017. William Bannan.
H. R. 10032. Ephraim Whitson.
H. R. 10056. Henry F. Sager.
H. R. 10089. Milton T. Bedford.
H. R. 10123. William B. McCurdy.
H. R. 10128. Lucian B. Walker.

alias Burt Crowell.
H. R. 10145. William S. Webb.
alias William Stoddard.

H. R. 10184. William W. Counts.
H. R. 10232. Mitchell Mason.
H. R. 10293. Charles B. Griffin.
H. R. 10293. Charles McCarroll.
H. R. 10314. Peter Minihan.
H. R. 10342. Hiram H. Reed.
H. R. 10345. Samuel V. Bocock.
H. R. 10348. Julia A. Gorman.
H. R. 10384. Foster D. Brown.
H. R. 10405. Benjamin Macy.
H. R. 10449. John Sherrard.
H. R. 10452. Joseph Morrison.
H. R. 10453. Dallas Runyon.
H. R. 10469. John H. Allen.
H. R. 10464. Henrietta Schmidt.
H. R. 10480. Arvilla I. Briggs.
H. R. 10486. Zerah T. Baker.
H. R. 10496. John Charles.
H. R. 10504. Elijah L. Wyatt.
H. R. 10508. Joshua S. Fisher.
H. R. 10510. Nathan C. Messick.
H. R. 10513. Molten R. Pepper.
H. R. 10533. Sarah C. Frankford.
H. R. 10559. Mathias Kitzel.
H. R. 10560. Archable Dougherty.
H. R. 10561. Henry W. Wright.
H. R. 10570. Martin De Gopper.

H. R. 10571. Daniel W. Spring.
H. R. 10596. George D. McKinney.
H. R. 10635. Samuel M. Boone.
H. R. 10637. Johnson Hatfield.
H. R. 10641. Phineas B. Egan.
H. R. 10645. Andrew J. Green.
H. R. 10647. Elijah Coffman.
H. R. 10677. William W. Agee.
H. R. 10678. Henry Burman.
H. R. 10683. Samuel Jack.
H. R. 10686. George A. Burgess.
H. R. 10700. Lettie Edle.
H. R. 10706. Martin T. Shadwick.
H. R. 10707. Elijah J. Farlow.
H. R. 10729. George W. Monmon.

neir.
H. R. 10736. Joseph Letzkus.
H. R. 10737. John H. Davidson.
H. R. 10738. Samuel J. Henderson.
H. R. 10740. Sylvania Farmer.
H. R. 10751. William B. Carr.
H. R. 10756. Horace E. Hand.
H. R. 10769. Joseph B. Donn.
H. R. 10771. Edward Searis.
H. R. 10779. James Custer.
H. R. 10780. Welcome Ashbrook.
H. R. 10797. Thaddeus Clark.
H. R. 10812. Charles J. Mead.
H. R. 10829. Jacob Hamon.
H. R. 10831. William L. Stephen.

son.
H. R. 10837. Alonzo Green.
H. R. 10865. James F. McLuen.
H. R. 10869. Etta C. Bartholomew.
H. R. 10881. Almeron D. Martin.
H. R. 10906. Harriet L. MacGregor.
H. R. 10917. Joseph Wiley.
H. R. 10942. William A. Hartley.
H. R. 10946. Myrtle Collyer.
H. R. 10949. William H. Beal.
H. R. 10963. John H. King.
H. R. 10964. Charles Brady.
H. R. 10967. Sedonia A. Smedley.
H. R. 10968. James A. Ri.

wood.
H. R. 10986. William P. Underwood.
H. R. 11034. Samuel P. Thurber.
H. R. 11044. Charles H. Williams.
H. R. 11050. Benjamin F. Smith.
H. R. 11052. John A. Sare.
H. R. 11063. John Brocius.
H. R. 11089. George C. Miller.
H. R. 11095. William Mitchell, alias William Terow.
H. R. 11096. John T. Axline.
H. R. 11098. William A. Bivens.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. RUSSELL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. SMALL, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, with Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pascagoula, Wolf, Jordan, Pearl, and East Pearl Rivers, and Biloxi Harbor, Miss.: For maintenance, \$15,000.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In all the bills heretofore passed, just after that provision for the Pascagoula, Wolf, Jordan, and other rivers, the item for the Yazoo River and its tributaries has been carried. I notice that in this bill that is put over with the Arkansas items. I was going to suggest that the item on page 9, beginning with line 7, be transferred to this point, if it is satisfactory. That is the place where it has always been.

Mr. SMALL. I can explain that. In the formulation of this bill it was arranged by engineer districts, and these two projects to which the gentleman refers just happen to be in different engineer districts. This was thought to be a better arrangement than the one we had heretofore followed, which was largely by location and nearness to each other. This arrangement is followed throughout the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Very well. I do not care to disturb it. I was just wondering why it was.

Mr. SMALL. That is the only reason.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. In referring to a bill of two or three years ago to see what provision was made for the Yazoo River, and then referring to this bill, a casual examination would indicate that the item had been omitted; but I have no objection to this arrangement, if the committee think it the better one.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio River to and including the mouth of the Missouri River: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$100,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. I wish to discuss briefly conditions on the Mississippi River, because it occurs to me that we are facing one of the most important problems in reference to inland-waterway navigation that can possibly be considered by this country. Briefly, I desire from the record to show conditions as they exist on this river at the present time. We have spent on the Mississippi River, in round numbers, or have appropriated, over \$170,000,000. I have given a statement, and made some comparisons in the minority report, which ought to receive consideration from those who desire to know how the Government money is being expended and what return is had for this enormous expenditure.

I quote briefly from the hearings on page 85, where Col. Newcomer makes this statement regarding the upper Mississippi:

The 4½-foot project is said to have been completed on the upper Mississippi, and I think they have substantially that depth all the time. Of course, in a stream subject to such variations of stage such as the Mississippi, during these changes of stages it is always changing on the bar, and there will be some periods possibly when there may be a less depth than a depth of only 3½ feet.

Col. Keller was before our committee. He is a very able Army engineer, and he discussed this same question and suggested that there was an excellent depth of water at the present time in the river. This was at hearings on inland-waterway transportation, on page 19. Among other things the question was asked:

Mr. FREAR. Now, let us see on what point we are in agreement. We have spent something like \$100,000,000 on the lower Mississippi from St. Louis down to New Orleans. That is a channel of 9 feet on the average. Is it not?

Col. KELLER. It is supposed to be 8 feet from St. Louis to the mouth of the Ohio, and 9 feet from there down.

Mr. FREAR. Of course, that is a condition which is far better than in any European country, and yet we have no line of boats between these two points.

Col. KELLER. That is an admitted fact.

Mr. FREAR. And the commerce has depreciated, as estimated, 90 per cent, which I presume is true. Now, do you believe that the fault lies with the railroad systems?

Col. KELLER. Undoubtedly.

Again, a little further down, the question was asked:

Mr. FREAR. On the upper Mississippi we have appropriated something like \$30,000,000 thus far and we have very little there. I think we will agree on that.

Col. KELLER. Yes.

In that, reference was made to the commerce, which is insignificant, with an average haul of only 14 miles. Appropriations on the Mississippi above the mouth of the Ohio reach over \$50,000,000, with practically no result commercially on the finest inland waterway in the country.

On page 20 of this report the further statement was made by Col. Keller:

Mr. FREAR. Now, what do your people propose to do; what change do you propose to make at this time so as to eliminate this situation in regard to railroad discrimination in rates? You say you propose to place some boats upon the Mississippi River?

Col. KELLER. None for the purpose of curing the general situation. I have already explained that the boats are to be placed upon the upper Mississippi River, and they have been authorized to be built for a special purpose, and I think that that special use is possible in the face of existing railroad rates. There is no necessity for changing railroad rates in order to make special traffic profitable. That is Mr. Goltra's proposition. He has already satisfied himself, and the rest of us are agreed with him, that such business can be carried on without difficulty.

On page 21 Col. Keller says:

Col. KELLER. We have had many applications, but none that are predicated upon as tangible a basis as Mr. Goltra's. For example, the people who are interested in the New Orleans-St. Louis line, that has been under discussion for some time past in these two cities and elsewhere in the valley intervening, have been anxious to have the Government build a fleet of them much the same as is proposed by Mr. Goltra, and have expressed a desire to lease it from the Government. We have not up to the present time found any authority under which we construct such a fleet. The authority given by the Shipping Board to construct this fleet for Mr. Goltra is specially limited to that case alone.

Here we have a statement that Mr. Goltra's is the only application of many that could be considered, and that the authority given by the Shipping Board is for a fleet for Mr. Goltra, specially limited to his case alone.

Again, at the bottom of page 20:

Mr. FREAR. The Government provides the boats?

Col. KELLER. Yes, sir; towboats and barges. We are going to build 4 towboats and 24 large barges.

Mr. FREAR. And they are to be leased; or what arrangement made? Col. KELLER. Leased under equitable conditions to Mr. Goltra or an operating company.

I will show that the Government is to build these boats, at a cost of \$3,360,000, for Mr. Goltra's use, as stated. That is the proposal.

On page 23 Col. Keller further says, in reply to a question:

Mr. FREAR. Do you believe, getting back to the original point, which is the important one in determining our action in regard to transportation, do you believe that this can be carried on profitably, notwithstanding the present railroad rates?

Col. KELLER. Yes, sir; I do; but on the upper Mississippi only in this special traffic—

Not for general or public use; only for this special traffic of Mr. Goltra's. What justification exists for this \$3,360,000 contract to be made by the Shipping Board?

Eight years ago, Mr. Chairman, this Congress appropriated \$500,000 and placed that money in the hands of our Army engineers for an experimental fleet upon the Mississippi River for the purpose of determining whether or not we can carry on any substantial commerce.

I will not read the conditions, but it provides that Congress is to receive reports of what use can be made of the river, to be determined by experiments.

Two years ago Congress again, as an amendment to a bill, passed a brief statute which provided that the engineers were to immediately make experiments and report within two years what could be done on this great river in stimulating commerce.

For eight years that other statute has been on the books, with \$500,000 in the hands of the Army engineers for experimental work. We have put \$170,000,000 into the Mississippi River for improvement. The Government engineers have been given from one to two million dollars annually in recent years for continual river improvement on the finest river in the world, on which we have lost 95 per cent of a once great commerce; and yet no report has come from the Army engineers to show that the stream can be utilized—that they are making any experiments. Why not? What have they been doing? To my mind it is an astounding situation. The report of Col. Townsend proposed to stop all improvements, except on the Mississippi and Ohio, until we could demonstrate that the rivers would carry commerce profitably, as rivers do in Europe—not to spend more for new improvements but to ascertain how to use those we have. And yet, in the hearings, the statement of Col. Keller is that there is practically no commerce on the river, and the Army engineers have not shown any development of commerce under the power given them to buy or build boats or to indulge in commercial experiments. Now comes an offer from Col. Goltra, of St. Louis, a private individual, who makes a statement that he has been given a lease, or is about to be given a lease, which has been referred to in the minority report—a lease of boats that are to be built by the Government at a cost of \$3,360,000 for two dozen barges. That is in addition to four towboats, and I wish to read what he says on that same subject.

Col. Goltra, whose military title, I assume, is political, last year made experiments on the Mississippi River. He has a steel plant in St. Louis, and he proposed to carry ore from St. Paul to St. Louis and carry coal back, which, of course, if it can be done, will be of some commercial benefit to Col. Goltra, although in this case, as I have shown from Col. Keller's statement, it is for Col. Goltra's special purpose alone, and it is going to Col. Goltra's steel plant in boats for his special use. Referring to his past experience, which consisted in one trip on the river last year, on page 38 of the hearings on the inland waterways Col. Goltra says:

She drew between 5 and 6 feet. After struggling with the *Nokomis* to the extent of taking everything off of her except, as the captain expressed it, the cook and the paint, we finally succeeded in getting her down to St. Louis in the latter part of October, and when we got to Alton the barges were there awaiting us, and we hooked up and came into St. Louis, having no difficulty from that time on. The financial result being that all the money that had been made in going up the stream was lost in getting the *Nokomis* back to deep water, and about \$10,000 besides. That is what it cost to get the boat down.

On this trip Col. Goltra had the use of Government boats for a nominal rental in making an experimental trip, as described.

In other words, he lost \$10,000 in that trip, the only experimental trip we know anything about, and one in which he experimented with Government boats furnished by Army engineers.

Further down on the same page—38—he says of that trip:

We came down, I repeat, over that 675 miles with the lowest stage of water that there ever has been in the river, so far as history tells us, with no difficulty, comparatively speaking, with our load—the barges were loaded—but with all kinds of difficulty with the deep-water boat. In other words, it was clear that a deep-water boat was not a proper boat for the upper Mississippi in the low-water months of the year, and certainly not the proper boat when the river is lower than it was ever known to have been before.

In other words, Col. Goltra said with the river at a low stage, the lowest ever known, he was able to bring down loaded barges without difficulty. The trouble came with the experimental tow-boats they built, which drew about 6 feet of water. Think of engineers building boats of that draft for river traffic. But Goltra says nothing is the matter with the river.

Here is a further statement, on page 39, by Col. Goltra. He says:

I would state, gentlemen, that this was done on a commercial-sized basis. I call it to your attention again that what I was endeavoring to do was twofold: First, to find out whether the river was in a condition that made it and rendered it navigable now; and, second, the trip was made for the purpose of determining just exactly what was the kind of vessel or vessels best adapted for the purpose. Both of the objects sought were accomplished. To my surprise, gentlemen, the condition of the river from St. Louis to St. Paul was very much better than I had any idea. I was like a great many—in fact, like the people of St. Paul, who thought that I would never get through with that enormous fleet.

Let it be understood at this point that the river is in proper shape, plenty of water; but after spending nearly \$170,000,000 it is minus boats, and the \$500,000 given to the engineers to build boats has been without results, at least nothing has come to Congress.

We have the testimony of all these gentlemen—Col. Newcomer, Col. Keller, and Col. Goltra, all colonels—to the effect that on this river, upon which we have spent \$170,000,000, that is to-day practically without any commerce, conditions are all that can be asked for carrying commerce. Col. Goltra now desires to make a contract, and is expecting to make a contract, not through the Rivers and Harbors Committee but through the Shipping Board. The Army engineers have refused to make any experiments worth while, because we have had no report from them that gives us any information of what can be done on the river. It is left for Col. Goltra.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I ask unanimous consent to put two or three paragraphs in the Record in regard to Col. Goltra's testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by including the matter referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. On page 48 Col. Goltra says as follows:

If I can eventually purchase this fleet for \$1,700,000 that has cost \$3,360,000, that money will cost me 6 per cent per annum; that is, \$283 a day. I know the number of men that are going on that boat to operate it—I am speaking now of one boat—and I know how much they will cost and how much they will eat; that will cost me just \$36 a day.

This is to prove he thinks he can make it profitable for himself in his steel business.

Further down on the same page he says:

My scheme contemplates creating a body politic, to be known, for instance, as the Mississippi Valley Transportation Co., and that transportation company will take over a railroad, the control of which I have secured—the option on the railroad—that railroad will bring over the coal from the mines, 25 miles down to the river, and the cost in the matter will be the cost of raising the coal and putting it on board the boat.

On pages 43 and 44:

Mr. SWITZER. Just one more question: Mr. Keller stated that the steamers would cost about \$300,000. I don't believe he stated what the barges would cost; do you know?

Mr. GOLTRA. I think about \$100,000.

Mr. SWITZER. A piece?

Mr. GOLTRA. A piece. They will cost more than twice as much as they would have cost several years ago.

Mr. FREAR. What will be the total?

Mr. GOLTRA. \$3,360,000—that is the amount set aside.

Mr. FREAR. For this particular purpose?

Mr. GOLTRA. Yes, sir.

Mr. FREAR. Are any other contracts being proposed?

Mr. GOLTRA. Not that I know of. I am speaking about this thing because, with this thing a success, you will see a great many boats on that river eventually.

Referring to the new Liberty motor, Garabad experimental, \$3,360,000 fleet, to be built by the Government, by Mr. Goltra, page 46:

Mr. FREAR. I understand there is no such boat in existence to-day.

Mr. GOLTRA. There is no such boat in existence to-day.

Col. Goltra will build them with Government money. On page 47:

Mr. FREAR. And you think the river is in good enough condition now to give a good test of that?

Mr. GOLTRA. Yes, sir; I think we better spend \$3,500,000 now and find out whether our \$30,000,000 expenditure was worth while. Uncle Sam could afford to throw that over and give me the boats in the end.

Mr. FREAR. Do you think you could do that with the present railroad rates?

Mr. GOLTRA. Yes, sir; I was coming to that.

Mr. SWITZER. You think this traffic will continue?

Mr. GOLTRA. Yes, sir; I have ideas about that matter that will interest you. At first you may disagree with me, but on reflection I think you will agree with me. The cost per ton per mile: If I can eventually purchase this fleet for \$1,700,000 that has cost \$3,360,000, that money will cost me 6 per cent per annum—that is \$283 a day. I know the number of men that are going on that boat to operate it—I am speaking now of one boat—and I know how much they will cost and how much they will eat; that will cost me just \$36 a day.

And so on. He figures that if the Government will build in these times of war stress when labor is high and he can buy back from the Government at half price, or \$1,700,000, that it will be a good bargain for him sure. If the Government would pay his railway freight charges now, it would be very convenient. Remember this is not a war proposition. It will take two or three years presumably to build these boats for Col. Goltra to be used by him exclusively in his steel business.

Here is what he says about this fleet on page 47:

If I do not keep it going, if I do not do what I say, Uncle Sam will lose every dollar he puts into it, excepting the boats.

That is a prospect which at least ought to give your Uncle Sam a jolt.

Down further on that same page, 47, he says:

I think we had better spend \$3,500,000 now and find out whether our \$30,000,000 expenditure was worth while. Uncle Sam could afford to throw that over and give me the boats in the end.

I believe that was read before, but think of the proposition about to be put over by the Shipping Board with Government money. All for Col. Goltra's private business.

There is no question, I presume, if we can develop any commerce there, that it is wise to make an experiment. That is what Congress gave a half million dollars to the engineers to demonstrate. But this is a gift of \$3,360,000 to Col. Goltra. Why? I have objected in my report to making this private contract when the Army engineers have been directed, with half a million dollars placed in their hands, to determine whether that river can be made commercially valuable. I have stated at all times that we ought to improve the channel of the river. That is what we have done to the extent of \$170,000,000, which is an enormous amount to waste unless we use the river. These expensive improvements have been going on, and are larger than they were many years ago, yet with a loss of 95 per cent in the commerce since we began improvements, ought to call attention of the country to what we have been doing blindly all this time.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. The gentleman did not read all of that last sentence.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no; I want to state this in fairness to Col. Goltra, that he believes he can make a success of it, but what I say is, he lost \$10,000 on the only trip he ever made, and he asks this Government to put \$3,360,000 more into boats for his private use, and it is conceded by Col. Keller that no other business can be served excepting Mr. Goltra's especial traffic. In that he appears to be right. Commerce is not to be established for any general purpose, but only for Col. Goltra's purpose, iron at one end and coal at the other. Not for any general commercial use. We are not improving the river for that purpose.

We are digging the channel in the river and putting this money in with the hope that the people of the whole country may utilize it, not for Col. Goltra's private purposes. I said to him in my office, "Will you reduce the cost of your ore if you can get those boats for \$3,360,000?" and he said, "Excepting as it affects the general trade"; and that was a reasonable explanation. Grain, stock, lumber, and other commerce is not considered. Just for Mr. Goltra's private company, that seems to be the only use to be served. What I complain of is that, with this \$500,000 placed in their hands, the authorized agents of the Government, the Army engineers, have made no effort to develop that river, notwithstanding they have expended nearly \$170,000,000 received from Congress in the improvement of the river without developing any commerce; and now they permit this man to come here and take \$3,360,000 of Government war funds, as he says, for his own private business uses, to build 28 experimental boats—nothing like them, he says, in existence. And he lost \$10,000 on the only trip he ever made, and comes with the proposition that unless he can succeed those boats might as well be scrapped, because they will be of as little use to the Government as the \$170,000,000 river which is now deserted. Is it not time to inquire where the money goes?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] has said in reference to the operation of these barges by Mr. Goltra, of St. Louis. In my judgment Mr. Goltra is to be commended for his undertaking to demonstrate whether it is possible or not to navigate the river from St. Louis to St. Paul.

I remember a few years ago that there was appropriated \$500,000 for the Army engineers to determine if possible some craft that might be used on this river, and everyone who is acquainted with the Mississippi River hoped that the Army engineers would be able to develop such a craft by this time and be able to give Congress some definite information of what might be done. Mr. Goltra has at least demonstrated that there is a channel in the Mississippi River that can be navigated. The Army engineers have apparently given up the fight, or at least they are not doing anything to demonstrate whether there can be navigation of the river as it now exists with some new craft. Mr. Goltra went up there with a fleet of barges when the river was at its lowest ebb, and while he did not make a financial success of his venture, he has developed the fact that it was possible to go there with these boats. There has always been a difference of opinion in reference to the Mississippi River between the Army engineers and people who are commonly called river men. It has occurred to me that men who have been on the river and who have known it most of their lives, who have navigated it for many years, may be able to demonstrate something more if they are given a chance, even though the Army engineers are unable to solve the problem. We all have great respect for the ability of Army engineers who have charge of this work, yet it has not been demonstrated that they are always infallible and that their judgment has always been the best that could be had. Others may make valuable suggestions, at least. So it seems to me that in a problem of this kind the views of these men ought to be taken into consideration and they ought to be given an opportunity to demonstrate whether they can make suggestions and demonstrate their ideas in reference to the navigation of this river. Especially at a time like this, when transportation is so necessary and when the Congress has met all of the demands that it ought to meet in the way of appropriations, it occurs to me that something further ought to be done.

I do not live on the river. I live on the other side of the State, but I have talked with some of these men who have navigated that river in the past, and they believe that there is a way even with the low water as it occurs in the summer time and the fall and with the river channel as it is now, in which that river can be navigated. I think it is important to the people of the Mississippi Valley if it can be shown there may be constructed some craft that can be put on the river and carry freight. As you all know, in southern Illinois and Kentucky we have coal in large amount that is transported to the North. There is a large amount of ore that needs transportation from the North to the South, especially to St. Louis. There are other commodities that might be transported by water. I say these few words in the hope that there may be some consideration given to these men who honestly believe that a craft can be constructed by which the river can be successfully used for navigation.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to take up the time of the committee, and I told the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors I would not say anything at this time; but as there has been considerable criticism directed against Col. Goltra, to the effect that a venture that he now expects to engage in may be of some considerable advantage to him or those he represents at St. Louis, I feel that, as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, it is my duty to express what I believe and my feelings about the matter at this time. I do not think that Col. Goltra should be criticized because he is in a venture that will move a commodity that may be of advantage to some industry that he represents or is interested in at the city of St. Louis. I would have the members of this committee look to the Monongahela River, which is a branch of the Ohio, and whose navigation has been developed by the expenditure of twelve to fourteen million dollars. There will be a commerce this year upon that river of 20,000,000 tons, and it is an advantage directly to the men who have industries upon the banks of the Monongahela River, who in great measure own these industries and own the towboats and barges that engage in the handling of this great traffic upon that river, and to some extent it is true upon the Ohio. So I see no reason to criticize Mr. Goltra because he may be interested in some industry at St. Louis that desires to receive low-grade traffic up in Minnesota like iron ore. The testimony discloses that there is an abundance of iron ore near Minneapolis and St. Paul, in Minnesota, that can be transported down the Mississippi by barges at a low cost, competing with railway rates of to-day; and the testimony further discloses that there is coal in southern Illinois and in western Kentucky that can be transported from that region up to St. Paul and Minneapolis at a low cost by river transportation, thereby relieving the congested railway traffic of

the Mississippi Valley. Now, it is stated by the engineers and by Col. Goltra that this sort of traffic can be carried on with competition with the railroad rate of to-day. Why, then, should I, as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, criticize anyone? The fact is I desire the Shipping Board or any other board to demonstrate, if they can, the utility of the upper Mississippi and Ohio or Tennessee or any other stream. I have no objection if they can show some merit, some proof, that their scheme will succeed. I think that Col. Goltra has gone into this matter in good faith. Like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER], I think he is to be commended. Trips can be made in six, seven, or eight days from St. Louis by water to St. Paul or Minneapolis, and vice versa.

In other words, you can take iron ore down by barge in 8, 10, or 12 days, where it takes 6 or 8 weeks now by rail. That is one advantage that may be of great help in prosecuting this war. Like the Panama Canal, to bring ships now constructed through the Panama Canal from the Pacific coast to the Atlantic may be of great advantage in helping to win the war, so, if we can utilize the Mississippi, or the Ohio River can be utilized as the Monongahela has been demonstrated it can be used, I see no reason why a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors should object to a shipping board or any other board appropriating or being allowed any reasonable amount to demonstrate the utility of those rivers, and I want to say here that the testimony of those two gentlemen show that to-day pig iron can be brought from Birmingham to Sheffield, on the Tennessee River, down the Tennessee River, down the Ohio, up the Mississippi, and up the Illinois River to Peoria in much quicker time—in one-third or one-fourth the time—and at a much cheaper rate than transportation by rail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The observations of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] interested me, because ordinarily he is one of the most painstaking economists of the House. I was somewhat surprised indeed to observe that he would rise in defense of a proposition to turn over, in effect, Federal money to an individual, one of considerable influence, to organize a company for the purpose of experimenting upon a river, the success of whose navigation, the gentleman from Illinois admits, has not been altogether satisfactory. Col. Goltra, who is to have the privilege, or who already has the privilege, through the Shipping Board or Emergency Fleet Corporation—

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOOHER. I want to say to the gentleman that Col. Goltra has no contract with the Shipping Board or anybody else. There has been no contract let, and nobody has got any claim on this proposition. Col. Goltra's proposition, Col. Keller said, was the best one they had, but they had not accepted any proposition. Col. Goltra on Thursday, in an interview in St. Louis, stated that there had been no proposition made to him at that time, and that he had accepted no proposition. He stated exactly as he testified before the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was taking into account the statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FEAR], together with the data which he has placed in the minority report and the testimony which he cites as having been taken before the committee.

Mr. BOOHER. I think the gentleman is mistaken where he got his information. I do not know. I think instead of getting it from the hearings he got it from the private conversation he had with Col. Goltra.

Mr. FEAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. FEAR. I have given the testimony here in which Col. Keller recommends this proposition, in which Col. Goltra states he expects to have this contract.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman turn to the page where he stated anything of that kind before the committee?

Mr. FEAR. I do not want to take the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I would be glad to read it into the Record or to print it in the Record, as I have in the past.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman give the page?

Mr. FEAR. Let me ask the gentleman, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield, does not the gentleman from Missouri understand that Col. Goltra expected to get this contract?

Mr. BOOHER. I do not know what he expects.

Mr. FEAR. That is the statement in the record of what he proposed to do.

Mr. BOOHER. Yes; he put his proposition, but I do not know what the others proposed to do, and Col. Keller said he did not, but they were receiving other applications.

Mr. FREAR. He said no other applications would be considered.

Mr. BOOHER. Where did Col. Keller say that?

Mr. FREAR. I will read it into the Record.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Meanwhile, since Col. Goltra has come to our notice, I will ask the gentleman from Missouri just who he is?

Mr. BOOHER. He is a steel manufacturer in the city of St. Louis. He is a member of a large company. They get their coal from Illinois and their iron from Minnesota.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is he engaged in politics?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes. He is a Democrat.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is he a member of the Democratic National Committee?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes; and has been for years. It does not say so in the record, however.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He is a very strong man in St. Louis?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes. He is a very prominent business man, and he would be prominent anywhere.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is to such a man, I assume, that a contract of this kind ought to go.

Mr. BOOHER. Let me read what Col. Keller says.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It was with that in mind that I commented on the project.

Mr. BOOHER. As a business man no man stands higher in the West than Col. Goltra. I want to read an extract from the testimony of Col. Keller. Mr. FREAR asked this question:

Mr. FREAR. And they are to be leased, or what arrangement made?

Col. KELLER. Leased under equitable conditions to Mr. Goltra or to an operating company.

Mr. FREAR. Are there any other propositions in view as to the building of boats and leasing them?

Col. KELLER. We have had many applications, but none that are predicated upon as tangible a basis as Mr. Goltra's. For example, the people who are interested in the New Orleans-St. Louis line that has been under discussion for some time past in these two cities, and elsewhere in the valley intervening, have been anxious to have the Government build a fleet for them much the same as is proposed by Mr. Goltra, and have expressed a desire to lease it from the Government. We have not up to the present time found any authority under which we could construct such a fleet. The authority given by the Shipping Board to construct this fleet for Mr. Goltra is specially limited to that case alone.

Mr. FREAR. That is an unusual course, for the Government to build a fleet and then lease it as an experimental proposition.

Col. KELLER. As I have explained the committee hasn't any funds. We can not build any special plant. All we can do is to investigate the schemes proposed and decide whether they would be profitable as commercial or private enterprises—

That is the same as is proposed in this case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Missouri knows that I do not always follow carefully the reports of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] on river and harbor bills; but may I ask the gentleman whether this statement which the gentleman from Wisconsin has made in his minority report is correct? He says that the Government of the United States has placed \$3,360,000 in the hands of a waterways committee with which to build several steamers of an experimental design and to design new barges for trial tests on the upper Mississippi, and then the statement is made that Col. Goltra is to be the beneficiary of that enterprise and is to participate in the use of \$3,360,000 of Federal money for experimentation. Is that a true statement?

Mr. BOOHER. I do not want to pass on the truth of the statements of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I feel sure the gentleman from Wisconsin is mistaken in his facts and quotes from a private conversation and not from the record.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Missouri is an able defender of his State and has spoken bravely for Col. Goltra. I do not want unduly to embarrass the gentleman nor the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER], who ordinarily is a careful administrator of public funds, and who would not ordinarily support a Government contract that he was not thoroughly satisfied with.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not saying anything about a Government contract of that kind.

Mr. BOOHER. Here is what is said in the St. Louis Republic of April 6, and I want you to note that it says the feasibility of the barge line was to be investigated. I read:

GOLTRA ACCUSED OF TRYING TO PROFIT BY WAR—WISCONSIN CONGRESSMAN ASSERTS ST. LOUISAN IS IN DEAL WITH UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD—RIVER BOATS ARE INVOLVED—REPRESENTATIVE DECLARES MANUFACTURER EXPECTS EVENTUALLY TO BUY VESSELS AT HALF COST. [By leased wire from the Washington Bureau of the Republic.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 5.

Representative JAMES FREAR, of Wisconsin, opened his annual fight against the rivers and harbors bill to-day with the cry of "pork."

This time, however, he said, the pork was not being grabbed by Members of Congress for their districts but was being passed to Edward F. Goltra, of St. Louis, who, Mr. FREAR charged, was in a deal with the Shipping Board to purchase from the Government, after the war, at one-half cost of construction, boats built for Mississippi River traffic.

Asked if there was anything in the bill contemplating such a deal, Mr. FREAR replied:

"No; it is a deal contemplated by Mr. Goltra and the Shipping Board. But I refer to it now because of an appropriation we made at one time to test the navigability of the Mississippi River."

VALUES OF BOATS INCREASE.

"Mr. Goltra was very frank. He said the Government would have to pay twice as much now during this war time to manufacture the boats and that after the war he expected to purchase them at one-half the cost."

"I have always understood that boats which had been used for two years or so were of more value than when placed in the water the first time," suggested a Republican Member.

"That is the statement of men who understand this boat business," said FREAR. "And to think of it at this time when the allies are crying for boats and every shipbuilder in the country is expected to build boats."

"Mr. Goltra should not have one boat built for him for his private use during this war time."

FREAR said the boats would be used for Goltra's private corporation and that no reduction in the price of steel would be made to the Government by the Goltra firm.

PRAISES \$11,000 FAILURE.

"Will Congress sit silently by when the keys of the Treasury are being turned over to a private corporation such as this?" he demanded.

Outside his attacks upon Goltra, FREAR seemed to have found little in the rivers and harbors bill upon which to criticize, except a charge that river transportation upon the Mississippi had proven a failure and that it was not a feasible proposition. He charged that Secretary Redfield and Br. Gen. Bixby supported the Goltra experiment and praised the "failure," although it cost \$11,000.

He became eloquent about the recent election in Wisconsin and accused the Democrats of playing partisan politics. Political leaders saw in this attack a fear by FREAR that if the Democratic party in the next election makes as good a showing in his district (the tenth Wisconsin) as it did in the recent election he will stand a slim chance of being returned to Congress.

The bill, which was pared to the bone on everything except river and harbor work, which is necessary only as war measures, probably will pass the House to-morrow.

GOLTRA SAYS HE TRIED TO RELIEVE FREIGHT TRAFFIC.

Edward F. Goltra, president of the Mississippi Valley Iron Co., of St. Louis, who, at the instigation of the Government, investigated the feasibility of the barge line between St. Louis and St. Paul, referred to by Representative FREAR and for which the Shipping Board recently appropriated \$3,500,000, said last night at his home:

"From what you say Mr. FREAR stated, it seems hardly worthy of reply. It is an ingenious piece of verbal jugglery, the fallacy of it being readily exposed by a single statement of the facts."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then Col. Goltra does not agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BOOHER. No. I read further:

The congestion on the rail carriers on account of the tremendous activity due to the war makes it necessary that we put into use, to supplement these carriers, every means at our command. The shortage of coal in the Northwest became unusually great. It was plain that the only other means at hand was the river. Such steamers and barges as the Government had, which were only about 45 per cent efficient, were pressed into service, and I made a pioneer trip with them loaded with coal, from the southern Illinois coal fields to St. Paul, to determine the practicability as a freight carrier of the river.

The trip was a physical success, and would have been an economical one had the city of St. Paul been prepared to promptly unload the barges. They held us there six weeks waiting to unload. This, of course, occasioned the unusual expense. The steamer used was a lower river, deep-draft boat, and the trip downstream, bringing iron ore back, thereby was unduly delayed.

The object sought was fully attained, to determine the kind of craft that should be built for the purpose.

He paid \$10,000 out of his own pocket to determine it. I read further:

Mr. FREAR's statement that the boat will cost twice as much now to build as in normal times is correct. But, in my opinion, that is not sufficient reason or excuse for our not doing everything we can to move these important commodities—Illinois coal to the North and ore from Minnesota to the central section. As to the "deal" between the Shipping Board and myself, which he alleges, please quote me as stating there is none.

Mr. FREAR. None what?

Mr. BOOHER. No agreement. I do not think that anybody who knows Col. Goltra would doubt that statement.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Would it not be sufficient to call upon a member of the Shipping Board to refute that?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was reading from the report of Mr. FREAR concerning the testimony that was presented.

Mr. FREAR. So far there is nothing that has developed to disprove the statement that I made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, may I have a little more time? The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOOHER. I read again:

No contract has been made nor has any proposition been submitted to me or any company in which I am interested by the Shipping Board or any other board.

The extraordinary building cost will have to be absorbed in some manner, just how I do not know. The Government is just completing a large river steamer of light draft, and when she is ready it has been determined to take a cargo of 7,500 tons of Illinois coal to St. Paul. I have invited Mr. FREAR to accompany me on this trip to show him the feasibility and practicability of the Government's intentions. I am sorry he declines the invitation, notwithstanding his plea of pressing business in the Congress.

There is, of course, nothing in the implied argument that the fabrication of these barges will interfere with the Government's shipbuilding program, as they will be built in small boat yards located on the river, the use of which is not contemplated in the Shipping Board program.

Senging vessels could not be built in these small yards. St. Louis is using about 500,000 tons of pig iron per annum. This is equal to 1,000,000 tons of ore. It takes iron ore to make pig iron. I know of no one thing that will so greatly relieve rail carriers as bringing this commodity in by boat instead of by rail.

As regards the price the Government will pay for iron, the same will be fixed by the board, which is fixing all prices.

Mr. FREAR apparently has not investigated the subject sufficiently to know that the 2,200 tons of steel built into barges will carry a tonnage of iron ore and coal that would require 17,000 tons of steel built into cars to transport. The Government is trying to conserve its steel.

Right in that connection let me state that Mr. FREAR is again mistaken in the statement he made—not that he did not have some foundation for it. He said he had a conversation or consultation with Col. Goltra in his office, but at no time has he stated what was said there. Mr. FREAR also said that Col. Goltra was to pay 2 per cent for the use of the boats, and when he got through with them, if the experiment was a failure, the Government would lose all it had in boats. What he did say was that he was to pay 4 per cent on a lease of 20 years, and at any time within that period he was to have the option of buying these boats at the appraised value. That was called out by a question of my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] himself.

Mr. FREAR. He was to buy them at \$1,700,000, whatever their value.

Mr. BOOHER. No. He said they were to be appraised, and he was to buy them at the appraisement, whatever it was. The gentleman says that Col. Keller said that if Col. Goltra did not take the boats the Government would lose everything. He said that the boats could be used for transportation purposes either inland or along the coast. It is an effort to get transportation on the river somewhere. It was not to be a dead loss.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was attracted to this controversy by the statement prepared by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], and my interest, of course, was aroused by the address of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER], who, as I say, ordinarily may be depended upon as one of the watchdogs of the Treasury, to see that money does not go out for experimental projects or in doubtful contracts. I was rather glad, while I was not always able to agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], that he was able to bring these facts forward if only for the purpose of debate. The gentleman from Illinois, however, indicated that the Government had already spent upward of \$500,000 in an effort to build barges that would be suitable for navigation on the Mississippi. I am inclined to think that much more money than that \$500,000 has been expended for that purpose.

Mr. BOOHER. I wish every Member of the House had read Col. Goltra's testimony. He says in that testimony that it is better for the Government to spend \$3,600,000 to find out whether that river can be made navigable; and if it can not, he says it is their duty to stop spending money on it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is the statement of Col. Goltra?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And not of the Army engineer. Mr. BOOHER. Yes. He says it is a business proposition that he is offering to the Government, and that if it can not be made navigable, after spending this \$3,600,000 to find out, then it is the duty of Congress to stop spending money on it, and I think so too.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I take it from the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] that he is inclined to think that there are times when the United States Army engineers ought not to be followed literally, and that there are times when it is better to take the advice of gentlemen outside, like Col. Goltra, who has had long experience on the Mississippi River, and therefore may be better informed than the United States Army engineer. That is the way I took the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER], and it was extremely interesting to me to find him taking that stand; that is, that the

Army engineers having failed, after the expenditure of \$500,000 and other sums that have been spent in experiments upon the Mississippi River, it might be well in his judgment to take the advice of Col. Goltra, who is of good standing in St. Louis, a big business man there, and who also attained considerable prominence as a national committeeman in the party to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] belong.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. "The gentleman from Illinois" did not make that statement. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is mistaken.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Illinois said that it was possible that the engineers might not be as well informed on the question of navigation as some of these practical gentlemen, like the gentleman who happens in this case to be the Democratic national committeeman for the State of Missouri.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman from Illinois never said anything of the kind, as the gentleman will see if he will look at the Record.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; the gentleman did not mention Col. Goltra as the Democratic national committeeman. That is true.

Mr. FOSTER. No; nor did he mention Col. Goltra in that connection. He did say this, and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Most of my time was taken by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER]. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman proceeding for five minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman from Illinois said this: That the Army engineers had had a long time to demonstrate whether they could secure suitable craft—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Since 1879, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no; I am talking about the \$500,000—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Mississippi River Commission has been working since 1879.

Mr. FOSTER. I am talking about the \$500,000 that was appropriated some years ago.

Mr. FREAR. About 10 years ago.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not know whether it has been spent or not.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman from Illinois said this: That the Army engineers are not infallible—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I remember that.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may have the idea that they are infallible.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I do not have any such idea.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman from Illinois did not say anything about Col. Goltra's contract or wanting a contract.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman very studiously avoided saying anything about Col. Goltra. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOSTER. But he said that rivermen who had navigated that river for many years in the past—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Men just like Col. Goltra.

Mr. FOSTER. Might be able to give some idea and be able to devise some sort of craft that could navigate that river. That is what the gentleman from Illinois said.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is really no difference between the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOSTER. I am surprised that the gentleman from Pennsylvania questions an item in the river and harbor bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I did not question it.

Mr. FOSTER. We spend millions of dollars in other places to which the gentleman does not object, and probably those expenditures are all right; but when an attempt is made to solve a problem out on the Mississippi River the gentleman from Pennsylvania seems to take exception to what men say about it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to say to my friend from Illinois that I did not intend to question this item as it is written in this bill. The controversy is over the Shipping Board venture. What I rose to say was that I was not only interested but somewhat surprised to find my distinguished friend from Illinois, one of the most careful custodians of the Treasury in this body, I repeat—

Mr. FOSTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Proposing that we should spend, through the Shipping Board or through some other method not provided in a river and harbor bill, what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] indicates will be upward of \$3,000,000—

Mr. FREAR. Four million dollars.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. By a gentleman who happens to be the Democratic national committeeman from Missouri, on experimental boats on a river which the gentleman from Illinois admitted the Army engineers were incapable of managing so that navigation is wholly successful upon it.

Mr. FOSTER. The fact that a gentleman was the Democratic national committeeman from Missouri or from any State would indicate that he was an honest man and that the money would be properly spent. That fact is a recommendation for him. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER], who had the floor a moment ago, certified to the high character of Col. Goltra in a manner that, I think, does both himself and the colonel proud, and both he and the gentleman from Illinois are entitled to great credit for the able defense they have made of Col. Goltra and the situation.

Mr. FOSTER. He needs no defense.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But what I wished to impress on the Members, who have been patient with us during this discussion, is this: At some future time when a question of experimentation on some other stream than the Mississippi River arises, I would like to recall, merely by way of proving up the consistency of the gentleman from Illinois when he rises to oppose such a suggestion, that in this instance of the Mississippi River, coursing by the great State which he in part represents, when the opportunity arises to utilize the services of a distinguished committeeman of the National Democratic Party, he is willing that the Government shall experiment with its money in testing out whether such a scheme is wise and calculated to improve navigation.

I merely want to have the gentleman from Illinois remember on some future occasion the stand he has taken to-day in favor of improving navigation on the various inland waterways of the country. I want him to remember, when the question arises, that there are other streams besides the Mississippi that he so ably champions. I want him out of the depths of his patriotism to remember, if it is necessary to build barges on the Delaware or the Hudson or to connect the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays, to bear in mind that on this great day in the House, when Col. Goltra was in issue, he took this noble stand for inland waterways.

Mr. FOSTER. The "gentleman from Illinois" well remembers in every river and harbor bill coming before Congress in the several years since he has been here the many pleadings in eloquent speeches the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made, trying to secure all the appropriations that were possible, that he has been able to secure larger appropriations for streams up around his city of Philadelphia than anyone else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to put in the Record the whole article of which I read a part.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Mississippi River Commission shall forthwith make an examination of the caving bank on the right bank of the Ohio River below the mouth of the Cache River and shall make such plans and take such steps, to be approved by the Chief of Engineers, as may be necessary from time to time to protect the levee line endangered by this caving bank, such improvements to be paid for out of any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the work of the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the item.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the committee I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. But I have made a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. SMALL. Does not my motion to strike out have priority?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. No; nothing is in order after the point of order is taken but to dispose of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina, does the gentleman from Mississippi insist on his point of order?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If I withdraw the point of order and the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina should not prevail, my rights would be forfeited. If I may reserve the point of order and ask unanimous consent that the item be stricken from the bill, or if the gentleman asks that it be stricken from the bill, I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. SMALL. If the motion is not carried, if it is necessary, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may then make his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks, in view of the point of order made by the gentleman from Mississippi that the motion to strike out is not in order until the point of order has been disposed of.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I can not withdraw the point of order, because I would lose my rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves the point of order against the paragraph, and the gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the paragraph may be stricken from the bill.

Mr. SMALL. That was not quite my request.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would not recognition first go to the chairman of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. That is quite true and the Chair recognized the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Who moved to strike out.

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman from Mississippi in the meantime made the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the Chair hold that the point of order takes precedence of a motion to strike out, the motion to strike out having first been made?

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair the point of order must be disposed of before any action can be taken on the paragraph.

Mr. SMALL. I do not think it is necessary now, Mr. Chairman, to argue the point. I disagree with the Chair, but I do not understand it to be necessary because the gentleman from Mississippi says that he has the right to make the point of order in the event that the motion to strike out is not carried, he is satisfied.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph be stricken from the bill.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be taken off my feet for a motion to be made by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I did not make a motion. The gentleman from North Carolina will understand that I am simply trying to preserve my rights. If the motion of the gentleman to strike the paragraph from the bill should not prevail it would be too late then to make a point of order. I am willing to reserve the point of order if the gentleman wants the item stricken from the bill, and it seems to me he ought to be willing to have it go out by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMALL. I want it to proceed from the committee because I am doing it by instruction of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this paragraph be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that this paragraph, page 9, beginning at line 17, be stricken from the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Reserving the right to object, there are other items in this bill which seem to me to be taking from the proper committee the power of appropriation. It seems to me that when the matter is presented to the Chair there should be a ruling on the proposition. The gentleman from Mississippi has reserved the point of order on this item and an item that clearly presents that proposition because it has no place in this bill. It seems to me that we might as well meet that proposition and meet it fairly, and therefore I object.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is the situation at present. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves the point of order to the paragraph. The gentleman from North Carolina moves to strike the paragraph from the bill. If a vote is taken on that motion, and is lost, then the reservation of the point of order remains for the protection of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I do not think the gentleman from Virginia will insist that anything is in order when a point of order is reserved, except procedure by unanimous consent.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Oh, yes, if you reserve it, it is lodged there, it is a sort of caveat.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I dare say the Chair will not agree with that opinion.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not see any real difference between the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS]. If you lodge the point of order and the motion is made to strike out, and the paragraph goes out, the purposes sought to be subserved by both these gentlemen will be secured. The gentleman from Mississippi said that he would yield to the gentleman from North Carolina to ask unanimous consent to strike the language from the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Absolutely.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That being so, the same result would be obtained by moving directly to strike it out, and the gentleman from Mississippi would not lose any position of right.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If the Chair were announcing that opinion as the parliamentary status, the gentleman from Mississippi would be much happier than to hear it come from any Member on the floor.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am not announcing any ruling, as a matter of course, but my suggestion, I submit, is sound. If the gentleman from Mississippi reserves, or lodges the point of order and the gentleman from North Carolina then moves to strike out the section, and that motion prevails, the section goes out and along with it the reservation of the point of order, but if the gentleman from North Carolina loses on the motion to strike out, then the reservation of the point of order remains, and preserves all the rights of the gentleman from Mississippi. That is a very plain conclusion of common sense, and promotive of the orderly and efficient conduct of the business of this body.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I have no question that it is in the interest of common sense, but it is not the rule of the House.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Absolutely.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of the reading of the paragraph I addressed the Chair and secured recognition and immediately said that by direction of the committee I moved to strike out the paragraph. Is it true, as a matter of procedure, that a gentleman may break in at that point and make a point of order against the paragraph which is moved to be stricken out? Can he take me off the floor to do that?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Otherwise I could not make the point of order.

Mr. SMALL. But all points of order on this bill were reserved. When I moved originally to go into the Committee of the Whole upon the bill, some gentleman on that side, possibly the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KENNEDY], reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. CRISP rose.

Mr. SMALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to interfere with the gentleman at all, and when he gets through I desire to give the Chair my view of the proposition.

Mr. SMALL. Very well, I shall soon conclude. The point in my mind is that having been recognized to strike out the paragraph, by direction of the committee, the first thing in order was to put that motion. Then if perchance the motion had failed, all points of order being reserved, the point of order could then be made and passed upon. That seems to me to be regular and proper, and I submit that having been recognized, and being upon my feet and addressing the Chair, and making the motion to strike out, the gentleman from Mississippi was not in order at that time to make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I have no interest whatever in the controversy between the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL]. And as far as the House is concerned, it seems to me that it is a question of tweedledum and tweedledee, for both want the provision eliminated from the bill; but I do have some interest in the rules of the House and the regularity of the proceedings of the House, and that is the only reason I am trespassing my views upon the Chair.

There is a good deal of misunderstanding among many of the Members as to when and how a Member may be taken off the floor. Where a gentleman has the floor I can only recall two ways whereby he may be taken off the floor. One is by lodging a point of no quorum, because no business whatever can be transacted when no quorum is present, and the other is by lodging a point of order against the bill or some portion of the bill. Under the rules and under the precedents of the House a point of order to be effective must be made before there has been any debate whatever on the proposition or amendment. If any debate has been had, the question of estoppel applies, and

it is too late to then make a point of order. When a point of order is reserved the only way it has ever been operative in the House is for the purpose of discussion, the object of the reservation being to hear the merits of the proposition discussed with a view to seeing if the point of order would be withdrawn. You can not offer an amendment to any provision in a bill to which a point of order is reserved, and why? Obviously, because if the point of order is sustained the whole proposition goes out and there is nothing left for the amendment to relate to. In the present instance the motion is to strike out the entire section, and, answering the argument of my friend from Virginia, Mr. SAUNDERS, if that motion to strike out is lost, he says the point of order could then be passed on. I do not think so. Suppose the motion, instead of striking out the whole paragraph, was to simply strike out some part of it or to add some new matter to it, and the motion prevailed. The entire text might be thus changed so as to relieve it from the point of order, whereas the original text, to which the point of order was lodged, may have been clearly subject to the point of order. It seems to me clear, under the rules of the House, if the point of order is insisted upon, the Chair must pass on the point of order before he can recognize or submit to the House any motion to amend or strike out. If an amendment is allowed, the point of order is waived.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It strikes me as a peculiar situation, and I made a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair for that reason. Suppose the gentleman from North Carolina, having been recognized, should carry the motion to strike out; there could be no point of order—there would be nothing against which to make the point of order.

Mr. CRISP. Then you would have the point of order reserved and held up in the air, and the House would never act upon it.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I will.

Mr. LENROOT. The amendment vote would be taken upon that, and the point of order would be waived and the reservation gone.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the whole contention advanced in this connection, it seems to me, as stated by the gentleman from Georgia, to be the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. If the motion to strike out should fall then as I have argued the common sense of this matter is that the section must be taken up for consideration, subject to the reservation of the gentleman from Mississippi. The point of order has been reserved, and action upon the same is not insisted upon. I agree that if the gentleman should insist upon a ruling on the point of order, a different situation would be presented. I understood the gentleman in charge of the bill to say that he moved to strike out the whole section. Now if those two gentlemen are agreed and if the action taken on the motion to strike out is favorable, then that will end this whole matter.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Suppose the motion to strike out prevails and the bill is reported in that form, and then a vote in the House is demanded, and the motion to strike out defeated, and the provision is restored to the bill. What becomes of the vote?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It will come up I presume in the House for a ruling on the part of the Speaker. Of course logically this would be the case, if the reservation is noted. In that event the reservation will go along with the motion to strike out. Should action on the amendment be demanded in the House, it would seem therefore that a ruling might be asked of the Speaker on the point of order. And why not? In many of these cases, it would be very desirable to have an affirmative and authoritative ruling by the Speaker, on questions arising in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the suppositious case propounded by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER], would the gentleman from Virginia claim that if a motion to strike out prevailed that the chairman in reporting the action of the committee to the House would report that that paragraph was stricken out with the reservation of the point of order?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What else could he report, if the reservation is noted? The two would naturally go together. If the reservation of the point of order is made and a notation of same made at the desk, why of course when the sub-

ject matter comes up in the House, the reservation would accompany the subject matter, and again, I ask, why would not this be desirable, and good parliamentary practice?

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I take it the Chairman would report not only the reservation of the point of order but the persons who participated in the debate, in the discussion, and the persons who—

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What is the reservation of the point of order?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. A matter of courtesy on the part of the man who makes it to give gentlemen an opportunity to make remarks not pertinent to the point raised and to make them out of order.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No it is something more. It is to preserve the right of a Member to make a point of order after other action has been taken. Under the rules, a point of order can not be made after debate has begun. But if a reservation is made, the debate may proceed indefinitely on the merits. After this debate is concluded, action may be asked on the point of order which pending the debate has remained dormant, or quiescent. And so by analogy, if a point of order is reserved, and the motion is made to strike out, then in the event of the failure of that motion, the Member who has made the reservation, and whose rights have been preserved by that reservation, can ask for a ruling on his point of order. Just as the reservation operates to preserve a Member's rights, pending a discussion on the merits, by analogy, it will preserve his rights in the case suggested. It is merely dormant while the House is voting on the motion to strike out. It is not in anywise destroyed, or affected by that motion, should the motion fail.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No, I will not press this matter further. I do not consider that it is important enough to justify the consumption of the time that otherwise might be used in the disposition of the pending bill.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent, to which I ask the attention of the gentleman from Iowa, and in a different form from that in which I put it before. I ask unanimous consent that I may submit a motion to strike out this paragraph, that the gentleman from Mississippi may reserve a point of order against the paragraph, and that the motion to strike out shall be put to the committee, and if it does not carry that then the gentleman from Mississippi may present his point of order. Now, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, if he is thinking that it makes a precedent that affects anything else in this bill, that his fear is groundless in that respect. There is nothing in the bill that is like it or similar to it, and it does not affect any other proposition in the bill, and I hope no objection will be made.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman why this unusual, unprecedented, and unheard of request to dispose of it in this way rather than to meet the question on the point of order? What is the object to be attained?

Mr. SMALL. The answer to that is obvious. If the committee had decided since reporting this bill that they will submit a motion when it came up in the bill to strike it out, then it is quite obvious they prefer to have the motion put rather than the point of order. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. GOOD. That is the only reason; that is the real reason?

Mr. SMALL. Oh, it takes time, the gentleman can understand—

Mr. GOOD. Is that the only reason? Now, will not the gentleman from North Carolina tell us the real reason, all the reasons that actuate him to have the committee take this unusual action?

Mr. SMALL. I have given the substantial reasons. If there are other reasons they are personal, not personal to me, however.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the Chair puts the request of the gentleman from North Carolina he trusts the committee will permit him to make this statement: This presents a rather peculiar question, in that both the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Mississippi have the same purpose in view; that is, the elimination of this particular provision in the bill. It is true the Chair did recognize the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the committee, who made the motion to strike out.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] could not be taken off his feet by any Member except in the two ways indicated; that is, either by the point of no quorum or by some Member who interposes a point of order. If the Chair had refused to recognize the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] for the purpose either of making or reserving a point of order, which was his undoubted right as the Chair understands the rules and precedents of the House, then he would

have lost that right if the motion to strike out had been put to the committee and had failed. It was for that reason that the Chair, acting in accord with the rules and the parliamentary precedents, recognized the gentleman from Mississippi to make the point of order; not to take the gentleman from North Carolina off his feet, but simply to preserve the right of the gentleman from Mississippi to make a point of order, or reserve it, which would give Members the right of debate on the proposition, but not the right to offer any amendment in the way of a motion to strike out, or add to, or take from, the provision.

Now, the gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to make a motion to strike from the bill the paragraph on page 9, beginning on line 17 and running down to and including line 25, and that the point of order which has been raised by the gentleman from Mississippi may be reserved, and that the gentleman from Mississippi will not lose any of his rights in making a point of order against the paragraph if the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina does not prevail. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa objects. Does the gentleman from Mississippi make the point of order?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes; I make the point of order.

The point of order is, Mr. Chairman, that this is a matter that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has no jurisdiction of as an original proposition, and it has no right to report it in an appropriation bill and give it the privilege that goes therewith.

The Chair understands that all jurisdiction which was formerly vested in the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, if it ever had any, over matters relating to flood control was taken from it and given to another committee that was created for that purpose. I think the Chair will have no trouble in finding the precedents there. They occur to me as being ample and full. I did not know, in fact, that the point of order had ever been contested.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors may conflict with that of the Committee on Flood Control, of which the gentleman is chairman, but the matters to be referred to the Committee on Flood Control are matters relating to flood control other than appropriations therefor?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have read this paragraph carefully, and I do not observe in it anything that relates to floods. It is a matter of shoring up the banks of a river.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. For what purpose?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Shoring up the bank of a river. That is all. There is not a word about flood or flood control.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. To protect the levee line endangered by this caving bank. The chairman of the committee will very frankly state to the gentleman, if he wishes to have this information, that this has no relation to navigation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Flood control, as I understand it, and as we understood it when that committee was created, meant the abnormal flow of the water, not the normal flow affecting navigation. So far as this paragraph reads, it may be regarded as a matter to protect navigation, a matter of improvement of the channel, which would certainly come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

What is there in the paragraph to indicate that there is a flood there? It is a normal condition, not an abnormal one. It is a matter of the natural flow of the water, which may cause erosion on one bank or the other. But there is nothing to indicate that it is a matter of flood or flood control. The Mississippi River is an uncertain quantity. It is a river in which the flow changes. It cuts in on this bank and it cuts in on that bank. That is the normal condition. Then there are certain seasons when the river rises and there are freshets which result in floods, and great danger ensues to surrounding property. Then it becomes a matter of flood control. There is nothing on the face of this paragraph to indicate that it is a matter of flood control, but everything to indicate that it is a matter purely of the normal regulation of the flow of a river. I beg the pardon of the gentleman from Mississippi for making that statement in his time.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It will not be stated by anybody on this floor that the purpose for which the appropriation is asked is in the interest of navigation.

Mr. SWITZER. I wish to say to the gentleman that I take the position that it is in the interest of navigation.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I withdraw my statement. I did not think anybody would state that. The river there is nowhere less than 22 feet deep, and runs from 22 feet to 56 feet deep, and the engineers who have examined it say:

It is clearly shown within that the protection of the banks and levees between Mound City and Cairo is not necessary in the interest of navigation; that water-borne commerce would in no way be affected thereby; and that the only benefits to be expected from such an amendment would inure to the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co. and riparian owners.

It is further true that in the hearings before the committee not a word was said about navigation. The whole issue was flood control—the protection of that country from the floods of the river.

The chairman of the committee told me that the question of navigation was not involved—and I know he will make the same statement here—and it did not occur to me that any gentleman would come here and say that when the river is at no place less than 22 feet deep, and from that to 56 feet, along this whole reach of the river, and that the engineers in the only reports that have been made upon it have said that it had no relation to navigation, and when the people who came and asked for the improvement asked for it for the purpose of protecting this levee, to protect the territory immediately behind it from overflow, and nobody had ever mentioned the subject of navigation, I assumed that nobody would claim it was in the interest of navigation, and I am quite sure the chairman of the committee will state frankly to the House that the purpose of it is to prevent the overflow of that drainage district.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order. Preliminary to it I want to state this: I am interested in the provision that is under discussion. After it had received practically the unanimous approval of the committee, I heard that this question of jurisdiction might arise here, and in order to avoid taking up the time of the committee with the discussion of the question of jurisdiction I gave consent to the committee that the provision be withdrawn from the bill entirely, and the chairman of the committee, in keeping with that understanding, endeavored to get the provision out of the bill in order to avoid raising the question of jurisdiction. But it seems that there are certain parties who want to discuss the question of jurisdiction, whether the provision is in the bill or not. So it seems that the question of jurisdiction is forced on the committee, notwithstanding the fact that the Rivers and Harbors Committee were willing to dispose of the provision otherwise; and I, as the member more interested in it than anyone else, was willing to have it take that course.

Now, I have not a particle of doubt on this question of jurisdiction, and never have had any. I do not suppose the gentleman from Mississippi will deny the fact that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have always had jurisdiction of this subject until the time when this Flood Control Committee was created by the House, and that if the jurisdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee has been taken away from it, it has been taken away by reason of the creation of this new Committee on Flood Control. So we start out with the assumption that this formerly was within the jurisdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and I do not think that proposition will be disputed or denied at all.

Now, the rules defining the jurisdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee have not been changed in one particular, and were not changed at the time of the creation of the Committee on Flood Control. There was simply another new committee of the House created, known as the Committee on Flood Control, and its jurisdiction was defined. The jurisdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee was not changed, and never has been changed in this particular.

When this question arose once before, Speaker CLARK stated that the jurisdiction of the two committees overlapped, and I think that is necessarily true to some extent, growing out of the subject matters which the two committees are created to handle, and there is always going to be a question of overlapping jurisdiction or conflict between those two committees. If the Chair will recall the debate that took place here when the Flood Control Committee was created, a number of Members spoke and said that the resolution was not in proper form in order to avoid a conflict in jurisdiction. Among them was the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who spoke particularly of that question, and he stated then that there would be an interminable conflict of jurisdiction between the two committees because of the wording of the resolution creating the Flood Control Committee. Last year Mr. Speaker CLARK stated in the House that the jurisdiction of these two committees overlapped. That is for this reason, that the Flood Control Committee was created for the purpose of dealing with the question of preventing or controlling floods.

Now, it may be that occasionally, in order to do that, something may have to be done that will indirectly affect navigation. On the other hand, it may be necessary to make expenditures for improvements that directly affect navigation and indirectly affect flood control. The two subjects are so closely related that you can not always legislate upon one without indirectly or directly affecting the other. That in the very essence of the proposition must be so. So the jurisdictions of the two committees overlap.

Now, whenever there are two committees the jurisdictions of which do necessarily overlap to some extent, I contend that the committee which first takes jurisdiction of a proposition ought to retain jurisdiction over it if the subject is one that it has jurisdiction over. The gentleman from Mississippi has just stated that no question of navigation is involved here. I should like to know upon what authority he states that. The Chair must judge the question from the language in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Undoubtedly the rule stated by the gentleman from Illinois would control if this had come in by way of the bill and had been introduced in the House and referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and that committee had been given jurisdiction of it, and there had been no objection raised, and that committee had reported it to the House. Under those circumstances, undoubtedly, as the Chair understands the precedents, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors would have had jurisdiction. But this provision presents a somewhat different question. This provision comes in as a part of the river and harbor bill reported by the committee and is not a bill regularly introduced.

Mr. DENISON. For that reason I think our position is all the stronger. The Rivers and Harbors Committee is an appropriating committee, has the power to appropriate. The Flood Control Committee has no such power. I contend, if the chairman please, that where an improvement like this is to be made on the river and an immediate appropriation is necessary, it peculiarly belongs to the Rivers and Harbors Committee. The Rivers and Harbors Committee has jurisdiction of all questions pertaining to improvements of rivers and harbors. In the act creating the Mississippi River Commission, which, as I understand, was river and harbor legislation, one of the duties of the Mississippi River Commission was to prevent the changing of channels of rivers and the caving of the banks, and it has always been understood, as I read the record, that legislation that is intended for the purpose of preventing the changing of channels of rivers and the caving of banks of rivers is in the interest of navigation. That is exactly what this legislation is for.

The situation presented is one in which the Ohio River is changing its course north of the city of Cairo, and it has been doing it for a series of years. It has been moving in the direction of the Mississippi River north of the city of Cairo, and it has gone so far that there is now only a neck of land still remaining between it and the Mississippi River. Some day there is going to be a calamity there, and the city of Cairo will be threatened. It is to prevent the continual changing of the channel of the river and the continual caving of the banks of the Ohio River north of Cairo that this provision is inserted in the bill. There can be no question as to the merits of the proposition. It is true that there is a question of controlling flood involved indirectly, but there is also the question of navigation involved.

In other words, I think the question of navigation is always involved when the river is changing its course, and I think the improvement to prevent the banks of the river from caving involves navigation.

The jurisdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee covers all questions of improvements of the rivers. A provision in the bill to prevent the change of the banks of the river, to prevent the washing away of the banks of the river is, on the face of it, an improvement of the river. The Chair can not say by looking at the provision that it is purely one for flood control. It says:

The Mississippi River Commission shall forthwith make an examination of the caving bank on the right bank of the Ohio River below the mouth of the Cache River and shall make such plans and take such steps, to be approved by the Chief of Engineers, as may be necessary from time to time to protect the levee line endangered by this caving bank.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is no flood on the Ohio River.

Mr. DENISON. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And none in the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. DENISON. No. It is a normal condition on the Ohio River.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The caving in of the banks affects navigation on the river?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; and it will affect it more if it breaks through into the Mississippi River.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But it is not a question of flood control; it is due to no flood, but to the normal action of the water; is that right?

Mr. DENISON. Exactly. The Ohio River at this point has changed its course a long distance, and has finally changed its course until it has reached the base of the levee.

Now, as I understand the parliamentary situation, if the Chairman holds that the point of order is well taken against this particular provision in the bill it must appear to the Chairman from the language in the bill that it is a provision clearly intended for flood control. I think the Chairman can not say that.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. Have not the Army engineers repeatedly stated that this caving in of the banks only takes place during periods of high water in the river when the rivers are in a flood state?

Mr. DENISON. If they have said that, I never heard of it.

Mr. HUSTED. I think it is in the Record.

Mr. DENISON. It is not in the Record in this case. But I want to state to the Chairman and the gentleman from New York that the Chief of Engineers and Col. Newcomer, for the purpose of getting the work done and because they recognized the importance of it, went before the Commerce Committee in the Senate two years ago to help me get a provision in the river and harbor bill extending the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission to include this part of the Ohio River for the purpose of having this work done.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If the gentleman will yield, that was after the House had passed the flood-control bill containing the item which extended the jurisdiction of the commission up the Ohio River.

Mr. DENISON. I beg leave to differ with the gentleman; it was before the flood-control bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman is mistaken. We passed the flood-control bill in May and it went to the Senate, and it appeared that the Senate was not going to pass the flood-control bill, and so the following winter, after the flood-control bill had passed here, for fear that it was going to fail, the gentleman got the Commerce Committee in the Senate to incorporate this matter in the river and harbor bill.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is mistaken, and, to refresh the gentleman's mind, I will remind him I went before the Senate committee to get that jurisdiction extended to the Mississippi River Commission upon the advice of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Absolutely. There is not any doubt about that, because we thought the flood-control bill was going to fail; and, in order that the Mississippi River Commission might have jurisdiction up the Ohio, we extended it on the flood-control bill, and, as it seemed that was going to fail, I suggested that the gentleman take that particular provision and have it put in the river and harbor appropriation bill in the Senate, and it appears there in the exact language that it appeared in the flood-control bill, which passed the House in the early part of May prior thereto.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman will recall the provision was put in the flood-control bill in exactly the same language it was put in the river and harbor bill before that. I know what I am talking about on that question. That provision was put in the river and harbor bill before the flood-control bill was ever passed, and was put in with the assistance and consent of the Chief of Engineer's office. Gen. Black went before the committee for the very purpose of getting this work done, because it was recognized as urgent and important. It has not been done, and this provision is put in the river and harbor bill for the purpose of getting the work done now.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Why did the gentleman and the other gentleman from Cairo go before the Committee on Flood Control and have a long hearing in order to induce us, in which he succeeded, to put this provision in the flood-control bill when, as a matter of fact, as he has just stated, he had already, prior thereto, had it enacted into law in the river and harbor bill?

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman is skipping a cog.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Which cog?

Mr. DENISON. We first got the provision put in the river and harbor bill in order to give the Mississippi River Commission jurisdiction over this part of the Ohio River to do the work.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. There was no appropriation or direction to do it, but simply extending the jurisdiction of the commission over this part of the Ohio River, so that they would have authority to do it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. That is all the flood-control bill did. Why did the gentleman go to the Flood Control Committee and ask them to put in their bill a provision already the law of the land, and take up two or three days in the hearings before that committee when it was already the law of the land? The reason the gentleman did it is because it was not in the law, and we put it in our bill and passed it in the House, and the following fall, when it appeared the bill was not going to pass through the Senate, the gentleman got the Senate to put it in the rivers and harbors bill.

Mr. DENISON. I will answer the gentleman's question. Of course, I dislike very much to differ with the gentleman from Mississippi on a question of this kind, and yet, I am so certain that he is wrong that I feel constrained to say so, because I followed the advice of the gentleman from Mississippi in the matter, he being older and more experience in questions of river legislation. We went and got that provision in the river and harbor bill first which extended jurisdiction of the commission over this part of the Ohio River; that gave them authority to go up there and do the work whenever they got the appropriation to do so. When the flood-control bill came up, we were appropriating \$45,000,000, as I remember it, for the purpose of doing work on the Mississippi River.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The flood-control bill did not appropriate any money.

Mr. DENISON. I mean we were authorizing \$45,000,000 for doing work on the Mississippi River, and it seemed to me that that bill ought to provide that the Mississippi River Commission could go on up this part of the Ohio River where they had jurisdiction and do work there, so we put it in the flood-control bill for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. But it was already the law.

Mr. DENISON. That is, they already had jurisdiction.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The provisions are identical in both bills. The river and harbor bill had passed and had become a law. Then why did the gentleman induce us to put it in the flood-control bill, when it was already the law?

Mr. DENISON. I will try to make that plain. It certainly ought to be plain to anyone who can read, but I will try to make it plain to the gentleman from Mississippi. In the flood-control bill Congress was authorizing the appropriation of \$45,000,000 to do what? To provide against floods up and down the Mississippi River. I think we ought to agree on that plain statement.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Absolutely. It was to authorize—

Mr. DENISON. They had jurisdiction to do that before that.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It was to authorize the Mississippi River Commission to expend \$45,000,000, to enter into continuing contracts therefor, provided only they should not expend exceeding \$10,000,000 a year.

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. So that it relieves them of the necessity of going to Congress every year for an appropriation. We did not extend the power, the jurisdiction, of the Mississippi River Commission in the slightest, except we did tell them they could go up the Ohio River and in their discretion make allotments for that part of the Ohio River which the Rivers and Harbors Committee for 20 years had refused to take care of. So the gentleman came to us and said that the Rivers and Harbors Committee would not take care of this, because they said it had nothing to do with navigation. He said, "You have a flood-control bill; extend the jurisdiction up there and see if they won't take care of it as a flood problem."

We said, "Very well, we will do that, we will take you in; that is, we will let the commission do that at their discretion," and lo and behold, as soon as the gentleman got in he goes to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and says, "Now, I am in; I want you to pass a law so as to take care of me first." Is not that the truth?

Mr. DENISON. Of course the gentleman has made a very good speech on that side of the question, and I want to say this to the gentleman: The Flood Control Committee was to make authorization of \$45,000,000 for doing work up and down the Mississippi River. In order that they might know that they had authority to spend part of that money on the Ohio River, we put that provision in the flood-control bill and—

Mr. SHERLEY. But, if the gentleman will permit, was not the purpose of the insertion of that provision touching the Ohio River in order to give to the Mississippi River Commission the right to continue its work for the improvement of that with the Mississippi River?

Mr. DENISON. It was for the purpose of authorizing their spending a part of that \$45,000,000 to prevent floods on the Ohio River.

Mr. SHERLEY. But the reason for giving the Mississippi as well as the Ohio was not simply for the protection of the levees, but it was to continue the improvement of it, and it took from the Rivers and Harbors Committee and gave to the Flood Control Committee jurisdiction for authorizations and gave to the Committee on Appropriations power within the authorizations to appropriate.

Mr. DENISON. Is it the contention of the gentleman from Kentucky that all questions of river and harbor improvement now belong to the Flood Control Committee?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is the contention of the gentleman from Kentucky that to the extent that the act gives control over the Mississippi and tributaries for the improvement and flood control that it ceases to give to the Rivers and Harbors Committee jurisdiction.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I question whether we gave that jurisdiction, only up to the point of the mouth—

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not say it gave the whole river, but the language of the act passed through the action of the Flood Control Committee says, "for control of the floods of the Mississippi River and to continue its improvement from the Head of the Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River," and then afterwards included these stretches in the Ohio.

Mr. DENISON. That language of the bill was put in there, but they can only expend money for the purpose of improving the river, in so far as the improvement of the river may control the floods—

Mr. SHERLEY. It does not say so.

Mr. DENISON. That is what it means, and the gentleman ought to know that.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know that, and I am not sure that the language warrants that construction.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This is a flood-control proposition, is it not?

Mr. DENISON. No; not entirely.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman say that?

Mr. DENISON. Certainly I say it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman say this in any way is related to navigation?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; and if the gentleman will permit, I will tell you how it is related, and be very glad to do it. The way it is related to navigation is this: If the gentleman knows the situation in Cairo he knows Cairo is on a point of land between the two rivers—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do know it perfectly well.

Mr. DENISON. Up above the city of Cairo the rivers approach each other and there is a very narrow neck of land between the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. That condition is growing worse from year to year because the Ohio River is changing its course and approaching the Mississippi River. There is now only a narrow neck of land, less than half a mile wide, between the two rivers. The fact that that river is changing its course, the Ohio River, by moving north is due largely, in my judgment, at least I am told that, to an old dike which was built from the Kentucky shore a number of years ago which forced the current over on the Illinois side and deepened the harbor at Mound City. Now, that has done that work well, but the current is still forcing its way along the north bank of the Ohio River and approaching the Mississippi River. The bank is continually crumbling and as the bank washes off it is falling in and washing in the river and the current of the river has changed a great deal, not very rapidly, but changed some. Sooner or later, with a great flood, this levee will go out and the river will break across into the Mississippi above the city of Cairo. Will not that affect navigation?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes; sooner or later the Mississippi River will break its banks and thereby affect navigation. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois this: I was a member of the committee that visited Cairo—

Mr. DENISON. I know the gentleman did.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And studied the problem—

Mr. DENISON. And I am sure the gentleman enjoyed his visit.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee (continuing). And there never was a claim there that this proposition had anything to do with navigation. At no point—

Mr. DENISON. Well, I do not know what the gentleman is talking about. I know that the claim was made before the River and Harbor Committee at this hearing. If the gentleman will go to Cairo, he will get some information.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is not this the situation, that the people interested at Cairo undertook to get the Mississippi Commission to spend this money for this particular work and they were not able to impress them with the overwhelming importance of it, as the gentleman views it? And, having failed to get the money out of the commission, are they not now turning to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

Mr. DENISON. I will answer the question.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman's permission, the only reason, as I understand, why the people at Cairo want this work done by the Mississippi River Commission is not because the Mississippi River Commission is engaged in improving the Mississippi River in flood-control work, but because they have special equipment there. I do not know whether it is under their authority especially, but it is under the authority of the Secretary of War and it belongs to the United States. It does not belong to the Mississippi River Commission or to the Flood Control Commission. It is the only equipment that can do this revetment work.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Was there any thought in the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, at the time you put this proposition in, that it was a navigation proposition?

Mr. SWITZER. Certainly. That has always been my contention.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is a navigation proposition?

Mr. SWITZER. Yes. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] took that position before our committee. His statement has been made there three or four times. We have as much right to rely on the gentleman from Illinois as on some Army engineers or others when we want to act.

Mr. DENISON. I want to answer the question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. I want him to go down there and see that situation. He makes his statement very positively, but perhaps he has never seen that situation. If he should see it I do not think he would hold the view that he states.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit me, right there, while I do not like to admit going to Cairo very frequently [laughter], yet I have seen that proposition time and time again.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman would be honored by going there.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am in sympathy with the idea of saving that bank, but I contend that it is not a navigation matter. I am interested in saving that bank, but the commission has ordered a survey to take place in May. This proposition which is in the bill does not order a survey; or rather it orders one, and then orders them to go on and do the work, notwithstanding the survey. It is the most remarkable proposition that was ever brought in. It is not a navigation proposition. It is a flood-control proposition. There is no question about that fact.

Mr. DENISON. Now, then, I will say to the gentleman that this proposition is copied word for word from the provision that was put into the river and harbor bill last year for Memphis, Tenn.—word for word—so that the gentleman evidently was not familiar with last year's bill when he made that statement.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. What was the purpose of the provision in the bill with reference to Memphis? It was to remove a mud bar from the city of Memphis. It had no earthly relation to flood control.

Mr. DENISON. I did not mean it was for the same place, but the language directing it was the same.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It was merely to get that bar out of the way, so that boats could come up to Memphis.

Mr. DENISON. But the Ohio River is forming bars with the bank that is washed down. It is a navigation question as well as a question of flood control.

Now, I want to answer the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. He asked me if we had not tried to get the Mississippi River Commission to make this expenditure. We have tried to do so, but they have held back on the matter because they have been working for some time under the wrong impression as to the situation there. That is as to the railroad question that they thought was involved. In other words, there is a railroad that runs along there, and the Mississippi River Commission has been under the impression heretofore that it is the duty of the railroad company to do this work. Now they have found out differently.

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand that; but that is not the reason for refusing to do this work.

Mr. DENISON. It was the reason.

Mr. SHERLEY. I say to the gentleman that since he talked with them they have testified before my committee on this exact point, and the gentleman is mistaken, in my judgment.

Mr. DENISON. I do not know what they said to the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. Take the bald proposition as it appears in the bill: Here is an effort by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to instruct the Mississippi River Commission in its duty. Now, if that is true, there is no reason for the Flood Control Committee existing. The Flood Control Committee has undertaken by the passage of an act to provide what the Mississippi River Commission shall do with a certain amount of money. Then the Mississippi River Commission comes before the Committee on Appropriations to get the money, but in the meanwhile the Committee on Rivers and Harbors proposes to come in and tell it what to do. If they can do that, any other committee can do that and override the jurisdiction of the Flood Control Committee. It may be desirable to be done, but on the point of order I insist that it is not in order that it should be done.

Mr. DENISON. Is it the gentleman's point that the committee has not jurisdiction because of the peculiar language it uses?

Mr. SHERLEY. All I have to argue from is the language you have used, and I say as to the provision you are carrying on this bill, you are without jurisdiction to carry it.

Mr. DENISON. I differ with the gentleman.

As I understand the rule, the Chair must judge the question of jurisdiction by the language of the bill. These matters that are stated extraneously are matters that may be stated, of course, in our attempt to enlighten each other, but the Chair can not decide the question of jurisdiction of a committee by statements of fact by Members of Congress, or can not even go to the hearings, so far as that is concerned; and I say as a matter of parliamentary principle that unless it appears on the face of the provision itself that this is intended for flood control, and is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Flood Control Committee and not in the jurisdiction of the River and Harbor Committee, the Chair should overrule the point of order.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I make no pretense of possessing any peculiar knowledge, or really any knowledge, of parliamentary procedure, but upon this question of concurrent jurisdiction over the Ohio River I have been to the Supreme Court once or twice.

I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] is absolutely correct when he says the Flood Control Committee took no jurisdiction away from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The truth of the matter is, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors never had any jurisdiction over flood control. The jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors from its inception had to do with navigable streams for navigable purposes only, and whatever jurisdiction they exercised in the way of preventing floods overflowing the surrounding territory alongside a stream was always done under the guise that it was for the purpose of navigation, for holding the water within the channels of the stream, and washing it out, and making it deeper, and so on. That is, they exercised flood control, but not flood-control jurisdiction, by subterfuge, as you might say. Sometimes they can show that it meant some little improvement of the streams.

So the Rivers and Harbors Committee never did have jurisdiction over flood control. And the Chair must recollect that the Rivers and Harbors Committee has jurisdiction over all the navigable streams of the United States, including the Mississippi River, on matters pertaining to navigation, regardless of flood control.

Now, the Flood Control Committee reported out a bill which became a law. The gentleman seems to infer that by the enactment of that law the Flood Control Committee in some way or other has now acquired exclusive jurisdiction over the Secretary of War, over the Chief of Engineers, and over the Mississippi River Commission. If you will read the section I assert that you will see that the law does not give the Flood Control Committee jurisdiction, and the law itself does not undertake to exercise any jurisdiction over any one of these functionaries. That act says that for the purpose of flood control and the improvement of the river—that was a matter they had no jurisdiction over, but nobody objected, and it is in the law. Of course, if some one had raised the point of order, the Flood Control Committee could not have reported out a bill for the improvement of the Mississippi River, especially at that time.

It says that not to exceed \$10,000,000 a year may be expended under plans of the Mississippi River Commission, approved by the Chief of Engineers. The truth of the matter is that the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War can control that whole thing. They can even nullify the act of the Mississippi River Commission. And if you will read the act closely, it does not give any jurisdiction over either one of these agencies, as I want you to understand. It is merely to be expended under their direction. I say, therefore, that the Rivers and Harbors Committee have the right to report out a bill, and we are an appropriating committee. We can report a bill appropriating money, and we can call upon the Mississippi River Commission to expend it in the interest of navigation, can we not? They have acquired no exclusive jurisdiction over that commission.

This equipment, that cost millions of dollars, paid for with money appropriated by bills reported out heretofore by the Rivers and Harbors Committee, belongs to the United States. It does not belong to the Mississippi River Commission, and the Mississippi River Commission is not subject solely to the orders of the Flood Control Committee or to legislation enacted in bills reported out by the Flood Control Committee.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SWITZER. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Do I understand that this will cost some \$10,000,000 a year?

Mr. SWITZER. The bill reported out by the Flood Control Committee some years ago, which Congress has passed, authorized Congress to appropriate not to exceed \$10,000,000 a year up to a total of \$45,000,000, conditioned upon certain things.

Mr. WALSH. And this paragraph is for that purpose, is it?

Mr. SWITZER. No; the \$10,000,000 is for flood control and the improvement of the Mississippi River. There is only a small portion of this that goes for flood control. Some three or four million dollars of it goes for flood control, upon condition of the localities concerned putting up half the amount. The rest of the money, some five or six million dollars, or whatever it may be, goes for the improvement of the river, a matter that the River and Harbors Committee has exclusive jurisdiction over if it wants to exercise it. The Flood Control Committee exercised it only because no one objected in that particular authorization. Therefore it became a law. Now, if there are some five or six million dollars, or if there is one million dollars, that can be expended under the direction of this Mississippi River Commission for the improvement of the river, like re-vestment work on the banks or levees or deepening the channel—exclusively a matter of navigation—that money is as much under the jurisdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee as it is under the jurisdiction of any other committee of this House when it comes to directing how it shall be expended.

Money that Congress has appropriated for the improvement of a navigable river is certainly subject to the control of legislation recommended and reported by the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and the flood-control act does not authorize an appropriation solely for flood control, but for the purpose of flood control and the improvement of the Mississippi River.

Mr. WALSH. One further question. In view of the dispute as to jurisdiction and as to the enormous sum of money involved, does not the gentleman think that the point of order should certainly be sustained?

Mr. SWITZER. That does not get rid of the \$10,000,000. I do not think the gentleman understands what is up here at this time.

Mr. WALSH. I am following the entire discussion, and I understand less about it since the gentleman has been talking than I did before. [Laughter.] I think if we can save \$10,000,000 this year we ought to sustain this point of order.

Mr. SWITZER. I will say to the gentleman that, as I understand, the Appropriations Committee will likely bring in a bill here appropriating some amount. I do not know whether it will be \$10,000,000; but this has got nothing to do with that. That will be met when it comes up, of course.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWITZER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GOOD. I understood the gentleman to say, when he took his place on the floor, that the question of jurisdiction was one that he had given considerable study to.

Mr. SWITZER. On the Ohio River, I said.

Mr. GOOD. I want to call the attention of the gentleman, in connection with what he is saying and what he has said with regard to the study he has given to this subject, to the hearings had before his own committee from January 22 to February 5, 1918, in which, on page 8 of the hearings, appears the following:

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. DENISON, a few years ago I assisted Mr. COLLIER to get a similar piece of work done at Vicksburg under the Mississippi River Commission. I am interested in directing this Mississippi River Com-

mission to settle this matter here, but I do not know, as to the points raised by Mr. DUPRÉ, whether we still have any jurisdiction over this commission or not. I hardly think we do, but I am not sure of it.

Now, the gentleman is very sure of it to-day.

Mr. SWITZER. I had not even read this act at that time. Since then I have read the act. I am directing the attention of the Chair to the act, and I say that the law does not acquire any jurisdiction over the Mississippi River Commission. It merely directs that a certain sum of money shall be expended according to the plans and specifications laid down by some department of the Government, which belongs as much to one committee as it does to another. Now, as to the jurisdiction over this matter, I want to make my statement as concise as possible, coming right down to the specific matter.

I contend that the Flood Control Committee and the Rivers and Harbors Committee have concurrent jurisdiction over the navigable streams, one for the purpose of flood control and the other in the interest of navigation. Does the gentleman say that the Rivers and Harbors Committee can not control the authorization for the construction of a dam within 6 or 7 miles of the mouth of the Ohio River? Certainly not, if in the interest of navigation. If we revert the banks in the interest of navigation, why should they object? Take the language of the provision objected to, which says to investigate the caving banks; the banks that have caved into the stream and falling into it are bound to affect navigation. Whether this affects navigation or not, we look to all the statements that are before the committee. For instance, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] has told you what he stated to us and that this would change the course of the stream. True, the engineer said he did not think it had much to do with navigation, but we are not bound by what the engineers say. We look at all the statements and all the evidence that is before us. I for one will always contend that on the Ohio River the Rivers and Harbors Committee has jurisdiction over the banks for the purpose of aiding navigation just as much as the Flood Control Committee has jurisdiction over the banks and can revert them to stop the floods. I think there is a concurrent jurisdiction, and under the practice the committee first taking jurisdiction retains it.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the ruling that the Chair will shortly make on this point of order has such an important bearing on the work of the Mississippi River Commission under the flood-control bill that I ask for a few moments to discuss the matter. If, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has stated, the Rivers and Harbors Committee can come in and direct by order the work and operation of the Mississippi River Commission under the provisions of the flood-control bill, then it may absolutely destroy all the purposes for enacting that legislation. It has been stated that the Rivers and Harbors Committee were unanimous, or practically so, about the insertion of this clause in the rivers and harbors bill. I believe, as a matter of fact, many of the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee held the opinion that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER] originally did, that this was a matter over which the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had no jurisdiction at all. I know members of that committee were opposed to the insertion of this paragraph in the rivers and harbors bill because they felt that it was without their jurisdiction.

I want to read from the hearings before the committee on the project. After a clear statement of the situation, by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON], Mr. DUPRÉ, a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, asked questions which were answered by Mr. DENISON, as follows:

Mr. DUPRÉ. Do you think you have come to the right committee?

Mr. DENISON. I think I have.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Was not a law passed that authorized the expenditure of a certain amount, up to \$10,000,000, by the Mississippi River Commission from the Head of the Passes up to this place?

Mr. DENISON. For flood protection?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. When that appropriation is made, it will be carried in the sundry civil bill; so, why don't you insert an amendment including that improvement in the funds carried in that bill? I merely throw that out as a suggestion to you.

Mr. DENISON. You mean direct the Mississippi River Commission to do the work?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. That is why I came before your committee.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I make that suggestion because that is the committee to go to, I think; and the Appropriations Committee will report the bill to the House that will carry the appropriations for the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. DENISON. Doesn't this committee make appropriations for the protection of places of this kind?

Mr. DUPRÉ. I do not understand that there will be any appropriation that will be expended by or under the Mississippi River Commission. Am I correct in that or am I making it too broad?

Mr. DENISON. I have not so understood it. I understand this committee has power to direct this commission.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this matter has been placed in charge of the Mississippi River Commission under the flood-control law. The hearings continue:

For this work, the people of Cairo will get the relief which they need so badly.

On page 11 of the hearings, after reading the clause read by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS], giving the language of the flood-control bill by which jurisdiction was extended up the Cache River, the Chairman of the committee, Mr. SMALL, said, after reading that:

So the question that occurs now is, as Mr. DUPRÉ suggested, whether this committee would have jurisdiction to consider any legislation commanding the Mississippi River Commission to do certain work upon the Ohio River between its mouth and the Cache River, and making an appropriation therefor which was exclusively for flood control or bank protection and not for navigation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this proposition is purely a question of saving levees for flood control. But even if it is mainly for that purpose I want to insist that it comes under the provisions of the flood-control bill. The Mississippi River Commission is charged with the duty under the law of carrying out the provisions of that bill, and if the Rivers and Harbors Committee can come to the House and take jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission, then I say that the Rivers and Harbors Committee can absolutely destroy the work that this Congress had in mind in passing the flood-control bill, and absolutely destroy the Committee on Flood Control created by the House for the purpose of taking charge of questions of flood control. It is naturally somewhat connected with navigation. If you take the speech of the Speaker of the House urging the creation of this committee it will be seen that it was a question of flood control and not a question of navigation in cases like this.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. The gentleman is aware that there is no flood-control committee in the Senate?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. No; the Committee on Commerce has jurisdiction.

Mr. BOOHER. When it becomes necessary to have a committee of conference, what committee in the House would have jurisdiction? The conference committee appointed by the Speaker would come from the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and the Rivers and Harbors conferees would have jurisdiction, would they not?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I think that is correct.

Mr. BOOHER. That being correct, then we have got jurisdiction. Then we would have original concurrent jurisdiction with the Flood Control Committee.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I do not wish to assume that the Commerce Committee of the Senate would destroy the Flood Control Committee for the purposes of the flood-control bill. I have been at Cairo and have seen the conditions existing there, and it was at the instance of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] and on account of the enthusiastic work of the people there that this location was placed under the control of the Mississippi River Commission for the purpose of safety and protection.

Mr. BOOHER. When it goes over to the Senate and flood control comes up in the Senate, what committee of the House takes jurisdiction of it?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. No committee of the House does, but the Commerce Committee of the Senate does.

Mr. BOOHER. It gets into conference, does it not?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes; of course; but that is not giving the Rivers and Harbors Committee any control over flood control.

Mr. BOOHER. They put it in the river and harbor bill, and when it goes to the conference committee it goes to a conference committee of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Suppose the Committee on Commerce of the Senate puts in a river and harbor bill a public building, and it goes to conference, does that give the Committee on Rivers and Harbors jurisdiction of public buildings in the House?

Mr. BOOHER. I do not think that is an illustration at all. I do not think it has anything to do with this proposition, because the Senate has a committee on public buildings and grounds and would not do a thing of that kind.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I would not swear to that.

Mr. BOOHER. The Committee on Commerce takes on the river and harbor work that ought to go to the Flood Committee, and they have no Flood Committee over there, and we take jurisdiction of it.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. If this bill should go without this clause and the clause should be inserted by the Commerce Committee of the Senate and come back to the House, and the

conferees should agree on it, I do not know what would be the result, but we know that the River and Harbor Committee has no jurisdiction of the matter. That is admitted.

Mr. BOOHER. By whom?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. By practically the members of the committee, for they come in here and ask that this clause be eliminated. I can not imagine that they would do that unless they felt that they had put something in the bill that ought not to go there.

Mr. BOOHER. I do not know what authority the gentleman has to speak for anybody but himself.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. They realized that they had taken jurisdiction of something they had no jurisdiction of.

Mr. BOOHER. I believe they had jurisdiction.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. That they were encroaching upon the prerogatives of the Flood Control Committee.

Mr. BOOHER. Suppose the point of order should be sustained and they should go to the Senate and have it put in there. It is put in the river and harbor bill, is it not?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. And it goes to conference, and the conferees appointed by the Speaker on the river and harbor bill consider it?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to answer the question? It would be the duty of the House conferees to insist that the Senate recede, because the Senate was legislating outside the jurisdiction of the committee that had reported the bill in the House. If the gentleman's reasoning be right, then you can enlarge the permanent jurisdiction of any House committee by Senate action, no matter how extreme it may be, and I do not think this House is going to take the position that the Senate can make our rules for us.

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, the gentleman is getting scared.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, yes; the gentleman is pretty badly frightened. It is simply concurrent jurisdiction, and you can not get away from it. We have had jurisdiction of it, and we do not have to stand up there and say to the Senate that we will not consider it, because they have no committee over there that can consider it.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Would the gentleman say that and admit at the same time that this is primarily a question of flood control?

Mr. BOOHER. No; it is not.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Would the gentleman say that if he felt that it was primarily a question of flood control?

Mr. BOOHER. Would I say what?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Is the Chair ready to rule on this question?

Mr. BOOHER. Does the gentleman from Texas want to take us off our feet on this question? The gentleman asks me if I would consider this a question of flood control wholly.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I would not say wholly.

Mr. BOOHER. There may be flood control mixed in it. I think that whenever you permit one of these rivers to cut through and form a new channel you destroy navigation for a while; it can not be otherwise, and if the gentleman has ever seen one of these cut-offs on the Mississippi River he will realize that, and it takes years to fix it.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Was it not the contention of the gentleman who came before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in this House that this work be done in order to protect and save a levee?

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, no; it has no connection with levee work.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. That is what the hearings say.

Mr. BOOHER. Oh, no; they did not state it that way. They stated it for the purpose of preventing the Ohio River cutting across a little narrow neck of land and turning the course of the Ohio River into the Mississippi.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish the Chair would hear me very briefly, because I believe the language of the bill is so plain that unless the Chair sustains the point of order a precedent would be established that is very dangerous. It is not simply a question of whether the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction over the Mississippi River. That is not the proposition that is presented to the Chair. The proposition presented to the Chair is whether this language carried in this bill is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to report. Now, I submit that if for no other reason the language is subject to the point of order because it undertakes to direct the Mississippi River Commission as to how it shall spend moneys that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has

no right to appropriate for the use of that commission and is not appropriated for that purpose. If this can be done every dollar that the Committee on Appropriations may report for the use of the Mississippi River Commission, and which the House may authorize and the Congress may authorize, can then be diverted by instructions from the Rivers and Harbors Committee. They might just as well have provided that the money which is carried for the purpose of taking care of the third liberty loan shall be used by the Mississippi River Commission in taking care of this caving bank, and they would have been just as thoroughly within their rights as to undertake to divert money that was appropriated for a specific purpose. Not only is that true, but the language of the provision itself shows that it is for the purpose of protecting a bank and not for the purpose of improving navigation. There is not a line there which says that it shall report as to navigation or take such steps as to improve or continue navigation. Now, the gentleman can not read into the language what he may have intended. So far as the Chair is concerned, the decision must rest upon the plain language itself and not upon what some gentleman may say, want, hope, or wish.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman says there is nothing in the bill that shows it is for navigation. Is there anything in the provision which shows it is for flood control?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think there is.

Mr. DENISON. Tell it to the Chairman.

Mr. SHERLEY (reading)—

Protect the levee line endangered by this caving bank.

Now, the protection of the levee line is for the purpose of flood control, and not for the purpose of navigation.

Mr. DENISON. It may or may not be.

Mr. SHERLEY. It may or may not be, but that is the plain meaning of it.

Mr. DENISON. Well—

Mr. SHERLEY. But aside from that I desire to call to the attention of the Chair, and then I am through, the language which says "that such improvements must be paid for out of the funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the work of the Mississippi River Commission." Now, what moneys are appropriated for the work of the Mississippi River Commission? They are moneys carried in bills from the Committee on Appropriations. What are the limitations upon the Committee on Appropriations in appropriating such money? They are the limitations found in the act in connection with the flood control of the Mississippi. We would not undertake under the language of that act to appropriate moneys instructing the Mississippi River Commission to do something not authorized by that act. Now, if that be true, after we have appropriated within that law, the Rivers and Harbors Committee can not come and reach out and take these funds created for an express purpose, and divert them to other purposes for which they were not originally appropriated, and if it can do that, why, jurisdiction of the committees does not amount to a hill of beans.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the ayes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. SHERLEY) there were—ayes 41, noes 11.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill, H. R. 10069, the river and harbor bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent (on request of Mr. ASHBROOK) leave of absence was granted to Mr. PORTER for 10 days, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 4138. An act to amend certain sections of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effective provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3802. An act authorizing appropriations made for the expenditures of the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Emergency Fleet Corporation, to be used for the purchase,

condemnation, or requisition of real estate, or the use thereof, when such purpose is not specifically stated in said appropriations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ROBERT F. BROUSSARD, late a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That a committee of eight Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of Mr. BROUSSARD, to be held in the city of New Iberia, La.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a very short letter in reference to the payment of internal-revenue taxes in installments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement about the payment of internal-revenue taxes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

THE NATIONAL HARDWOOD LUMBER ASSOCIATION,
EAST CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 12, 1918.

The National Hardwood Lumber Association, consisting of over 900 members, representing every hardwood-producing section of the country, by its constituted authorities has unanimously adopted the following resolutions:

"Whereas the provision in the revenue laws of the United States now requires the payment, on or before June 15 of each year, of Federal taxes, including personal and corporation income taxes and excess-profits taxes of large amounts, based upon income or earnings for an entire year, and as in many cases the income or earnings from which such taxes are payable are fully absorbed in conducting the business of the taxpayer and can only be withdrawn therefrom at great burden and inconvenience to the individuals, firms, or corporations by whom payment must be made, or, if the money be borrowed from the banks, with a resulting money stringency: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Hardwood Lumber Association strongly recommends to the Congress of the United States that the existing revenue law be so amended as to authorize the payment of the total excess-profits taxes in four installments, on the 15th of June, August, October, and December of the year 1918 and each year thereafter."

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN M. WOODS, President.
FRANK F. FISH, Secretary-Treasurer.

Executive committee: Hon. John M. Woods, chairman, Boston, Mass.; Hon. E. V. Babcock, Pittsburgh, Pa.; T. M. Brown, Louisville, Ky.; Theo. Fathauer, Chicago, Ill.; Charles H. Barnaby, Greencastle, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. On this bill?

The CHAIR. On this bill?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. On this point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS ON MONDAY.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on the Unanimous Consent Calendar next Monday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the business on the Unanimous Consent Calendar on next Monday be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman knows we have not made very much progress on the river and harbor bill, and we have the naval appropriation bill and other appropriation bills ready. What is the purpose of asking the suspension?

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important we should pass next week the naval appropriation bill, and in order to do that we ought to have Monday to finish up this bill, and I think we ought to finish it up Monday even if we have to stay here until 12 o'clock Monday night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE LATE SENATOR ROBERT F. BROUSSARD.

Mr. MARTIN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I send the following resolutions to the Clerk's desk and move their adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 311.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ROBERT F. BROUSSARD, a Senator of the United States from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That a committee of 11 Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will announce the committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ESTOPINAL, Mr. DUPRE, Mr. LAZARO, Mr. ASWELL, Mr. WILSON of Louisiana, Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. RODENBERG, Mr. LANGLEY, and Mr. RUCKER.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the final resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, April 15, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations required by the Reclamation Service, fiscal year 1919, for the Rio Grande project (H. Doc. No. 1038); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting withdrawal of certain estimates submitted for inclusion in the sundry civil bill, as printed in the Book of Estimates, 1919, beginning on page 487 (H. Doc. No. 1039); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting tentative draft of a bill authorizing the discharge of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps incapacitated for service by reason of misconduct (H. Doc. No. 1040); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4. Letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report on preliminary examination of harbor at Poplar Island, Md. (H. Doc. No. 1041); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

5. Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Caney and Live Oak Creeks, Tex., and report on survey of Caney Creek with a view to a connection with the inland waterway (H. Doc. No. 1042); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

6. Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Tennessee River, Tenn., with a view to locating one low dam at mouth of Whites Creek and one low dam at the mouth of the Clinch River (H. Doc. No. 1043); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10891) to amend and reenact an act for the establishment of a probation system for the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 488), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 2123) to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 489), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MCKENZIE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10175) for the relief of

John Berrin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 490), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CRAGO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10412) for the relief of Stephen J. Haff, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 491), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1797) for the relief of Joseph A. Choate, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 492), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 11429) for the relief of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co.; the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Co.; and the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 11430) providing for the payment of accrued pension to the estate of a deceased pensioner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 11431) to protect the lives and health and morals of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia, and to establish a minimum wage board, and define its powers and duties, and to provide for the fixing of minimum wages for such workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 11432) to fix the price of wheat at the primary markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 279) providing for deferred payment of income and excess-profits taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A resolution (H. Res. 310) authorizing the payment of \$1,200 to William McKinley Cobb for extra and expert services rendered to the Committee on Pensions during the first and second sessions of the Sixty-fifth Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 11433) granting a pension to Mae Ringwalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11434) granting a pension to Henry F. Henson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11435) granting a pension to George H. Pennington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11436) granting a pension to Abraham Crist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11437) granting a pension to William H. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11438) granting a pension to Austin Hemphill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11439) granting a pension to Franklin Kirby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11440) granting a pension to James A. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11441) granting an increase of pension to John Fink; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 11442) granting a pension to U. S. G. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 11443) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Jacks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11444) granting a pension to Emma E. Urquhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 11445) granting a pension to William H. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 11446) granting an increase of pension to James I. Mosher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11447) for the relief of Timothy L. P. Miles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 11448) granting a pension to Rose Ettie Sheppard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11449) granting a pension to Christine Heldt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 11450) granting an increase of pension to William Goodwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 11451) granting a pension to S. Ida Rhodes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11452) granting a pension to Lillia M. Collier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11453) granting a pension to Olive O. Norton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 11454) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11455) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11456) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Kurtz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11457) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson C. Garrigus; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11458) granting an increase of pension to George W. Thorneburgh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11459) granting a pension to Mary J. Kazar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 11460) authorizing and directing the payment of the claim of Edwin C. Foster; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11461) granting a pension to Angeline E. Holt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 11462) granting an increase of pension to John Wesley Melton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 11463) granting a pension to Florence F. Hubbard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of Harry W. Thompson and 70 other citizens of Gerlaw, Ill., protesting against zone rates on second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of sundry citizens of Barry County, Mich., against passage of compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAYES: Petitions of Free Methodist Church, Oak Grove Mothers' Club, United Presbyterian Church, all of San Jose, and Methodist Episcopal Church of Morgan Hill, Cal., favoring immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hebron Church, of Penn Township, Allegheny County, Pa., favoring immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Henry Barton Jacobs, of Baltimore, Md., favoring passage of House bill 9563, relative to grades for medical officers in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Boosters, Baltimore, Md., against passage of Senate amendment No. 41, relative to potato grading; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorials of San Diego (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, Lake Erie College, of Painesville, Ohio, and John McNeely and family, of Redding, Cal., against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED: Evidence to accompany House bill 11422, to increase the pension of William B. Denla; also, papers to accompany House bill 11423, granting a pension to N. J. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the National Security League, relative to placing Bureau of Public Information under direction of committee of three or five men not holding other office; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of New York Produce Exchange, favoring retention of pneumatic-tube mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Geneseo (Ill.) Creamery Co., opposing House bill 3777; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of L. P. Halladay Co., of Streator, Ill.; W. Shanhouse & Sons, of Rockford, favoring Senate bill 3963 relative to payment of income and excess-profits taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Pilgrim Publicity Association, against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Security League, relative to committee of three or five men for Bureau of Information; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 15, 1918.

Most Rev. Edward J. Hanna, Archbishop of San Francisco, offered the following prayer:

O God of our fathers, in whose hands are the lives of men and in whose power is the destiny of the Nation, look down upon Thy children gathered here in Thy name. In the way of Thy love Thou hast again visited this body and taken from it one whose power was our glory. Make us recognize that with Thee are the issues of life and death. Make us submissive to the decree of Thy divine providence. Thou alone can bring strength to those who mourn. Thou alone can bring peace to hearts oppressed by grief and pain. O grant that his loved ones may find strength in Thee to bear their loss. Grant that his loved ones may through their tears look up to Thee as the only source of joy and consolation.

Chosen representatives of a mighty people, we come to Thee in the most crucial day in the history of our civilization. O give us light that we may see Thy way among the nations. Give us strength that we may follow the light whithersoever it may be. Make our laws reflect Thy divine wisdom and may they direct the issues of the world unto Thy greater glory.

Give strength unto our President and to those in whose hands are the affairs of our mighty people. We pray above all things that they may have strength and power to endure and to fight to the end. Give strength to our men who in fields afar battle for our rights. Give strength to their arms that they may win victory and that through victory there may come peace. And grant, O Lord, that in the days of peace we may grow in power unto righteousness and unto the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of Saturday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) providing for the calling into military service of certain classes of persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11364) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the death of Hon. ROBERT F. BROUSSARD, late a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 3980. An act to prevent interference with the use of homing pigeons by the United States, to provide a penalty for such interference, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9504. An act to amend section 4067 of the Revised Statutes by extending its scope to include women; and

H. R. 9901. An act to give indemnity for damages caused by American forces abroad.

DEATH OF SENATOR STONE.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, Senator STONE died on yesterday, at 4.30 o'clock in the afternoon. His funeral services will occur at the family residence at 4 o'clock this afternoon. His body will be borne to the capital of his State, arriving there on Tuesday morning. It will lie in state in the capitol building a part of Tuesday. It will then be conveyed to Nevada, Mo., for interment amidst those surroundings where he began his illustrious career.

In a few days more he would have arrived at the allotted threescore years and ten. Over half of that long period he had devoted to the public service. He now returns to his State the badge of his office, upon which there is neither blot nor stain. Dishonor never laid its touch upon the life of WILLIAM JOEL STONE. It may of him be justly said that all his mature life

was devoted to his country. Possessing those great abilities which would have enabled him to achieve eminence in any position of life and to have acquired fortune, he chose to devote his talents to the public welfare and to lead a life devoid of luxury and to die without even a competency.

His love of country was so passionate as to be beyond the understanding of many men. His loyalty was so exalted that he was not always understood, for all could not rise to the sublime devotion which inspired his soul. I knew Senator STONE better than any man outside his immediate blood kin. I knew him so well that I am sure I knew his great soul—the soul of this great Missourian and great American.

Knowing him in this intimate way, I may be permitted to say that during the last three weeks constant news from the battle fields of France telling the story of how our lines were being pushed back by German hordes fell upon his heart with a crushing force. Of all the men I have known there is not one who seemed to me to feel so much the weight of anxiety for our cause, upon whose lips there was so passionate a prayer for victory for the arms of our allies and of our own soldiers. I use no extravagance of speech when I declare that could we restore to him the life that has passed out and bring him here among us clothed in health and flesh he would gladly give his life again if thereby he could serve his country's cause and bring to it a great and victorious peace.

At such a time as this and in the days that are to come, when the wounds of a bleeding world must be bound up, the Senate can ill afford, his State can ill afford, his country can ill afford, the world can ill afford his absence.

Mr. President, I offer the following resolutions, and ask for their immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 225) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM JOEL STONE, late a Senator from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of Mr. STONE, which will take place at 4 o'clock post meridian to-day at his late residence in this city.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect his remains be removed from his late home in this city to Nevada, Mo., for burial, in charge of the Sergeant at Arms, attended by the committee, which shall have full power to carry these resolutions into effect.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed, under the second resolution, as the committee on the part of the Senate Mr. REED, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. SMITH of Arizona, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. KING, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SUTHERLAND, and Mr. FERNALD.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I submit the following resolution, and ask for its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 16, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 15, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art supremely great, Infinite in all Thine attributes, our God and our Father; above all, through all, and in us all; make us, we beseech Thee, fit temples for the indwelling of Thy Spirit and tractable to its holy influence; that we may conceive wisely, follow the dictates of a clear conscience, and stand firm in our convictions.

Thus may we think well, live well, pray without ceasing, and be ready, when the summons comes, to pass on into the realms of the blest.

Death has laid a heavy toll upon the congressional family, leaving us to mourn, by the passing of two faithful and conspicuous Senators, the wife of a Representative of this body, and one of the oldest and most trustworthy employees of this House.

Comfort us and their several families, by the faith once delivered to the saints, through Him who said, "I am the resurrection and the life; whosoever believeth on me shall never die." Amen.